Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 2003 No. 45—Part II

House of Representatives

☐ 1715

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004—Continued

Here it is, very carefully worked out, using established models. In fact, Macroeconomic Advisors are retained by the CEA. We beat them two to one for one sixth of the cost in job generation and GDP growth.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). All time for general debate on the resolution has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendment printed in part A of House Report 108–44 is adopted and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 95, as amended pursuant to House Resolution 151, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 95

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013 are hereby set forth.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,323,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,350,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,519,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,662,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,793,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,902,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,017,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,130,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,235,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,364,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,502,635,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $36,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $116,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $97,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $77,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $60,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $60,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $60,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $62,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $191,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $285,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $301,575,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,790,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,838,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,952,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,076,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,177,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,282,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,383,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,481,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,597,191,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,704,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,832,479,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,776,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,847,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,943,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,045,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,139,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,244,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,350,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,451,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,574,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,667,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,803,936,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $453,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $497,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $423,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $382,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $345,935,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $341,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $333,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $320,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $338,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $302,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $301,301,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $6,687,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $7,264,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $7,794,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $8,302,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $8,777,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $9,251,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $9,719,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $10,179,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $10,660,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,112,000,000,000.

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.
Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Fiscal year 2013: $11,564,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $3,858,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $4,179,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $4,416,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $4,597,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $4,720,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $4,819,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $4,889,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $4,926,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $4,963,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $4,949,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $4,918,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $392,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $386,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $400,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $420,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $440,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $460,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $438,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $480,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $462,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $494,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $480,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $507,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $497,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $522,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $516,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $536,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $551,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,541,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $24,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $28,631,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $31,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $32,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $33,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $33,775,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,284,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $34,466,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,078,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,148,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $37,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,576,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $23,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $22,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $23,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $24,344,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $25,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $27,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $28,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,393,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $2,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $2,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $2,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $961,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $2,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $2,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,022,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $2,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $2,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $3,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,293,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $30,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $29,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $30,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $30,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $31,453,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $33,463,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $34,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,438,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,626,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $37,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,600,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $24,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $24,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $26,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $26,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $24,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $24,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $24,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,526,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $23,781,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $23,390,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $23,155,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,413,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $8,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $7,405,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $8,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $9,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $8,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $8,774,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $8,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $8,952,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,042,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $828,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,056,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $64,091,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $67,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $65,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,225,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $65,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $66,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $67,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $68,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $69,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $71,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,915,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $72,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $74,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $76,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,640,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,923,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,356,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $14,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,119,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $14,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $15,351,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $15,702,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $16,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $16,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $16,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,256,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,288,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $86,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $84,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $84,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $86,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $88,650,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,417,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $90,811,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $92,393,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $93,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $95,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $97,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $99,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,602,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $221,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $218,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $235,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $235,479,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $248,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $265,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $284,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $283,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $303,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $324,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $322,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $345,696,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $344,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $370,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $395,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $423,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $422,447,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $248,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $266,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $266,865,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $282,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $322,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $319,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $344,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $344,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $370,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $396,931,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $396,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $424,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $425,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $452,618,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $455,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $489,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $486,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $528,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $528,861,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $326,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $334,373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $315,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $321,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $325,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $329,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $331,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $334,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $336,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $338,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $344,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $345,993,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $352,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $353,901,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $360,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $361,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $374,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $375,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $377,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $378,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $391,496,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $392,351,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $16,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $17,975,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,975,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $24,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $31,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $34,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,481,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $57,597,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $61,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,119,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $65,847,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $64,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $62,348,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $65,696,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $66,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $68,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $72,714,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $72,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $69,867,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $74,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,198,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $38,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $37,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $37,676,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $37,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $37,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $38,884,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $39,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $40,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $42,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,855,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $43,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $44,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,471,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $18,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $19,779,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,038,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $19,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $19,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $20,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,374,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $239,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $256,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $256,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $303,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $342,042,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $367,472,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $367,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $389,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $389,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $410,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $410,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $429,676,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $429,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $450,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $450,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $471,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $471,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $489,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $489,580,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$93,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$36,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$15,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$42,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$42,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$52,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$51,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$51,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$53,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$53,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$52,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$56,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$56,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$59,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$59,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$61,229,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$61,229,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TAX SIMPLIFICATION AND FAIRNESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 11, 2003, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to—

(1) reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $35,420,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, $112,785,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, $387,719,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $662,874,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013; and

(2) increase the level of direct spending for that committee by $4,380,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003, $1,111,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $17,393,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $23,096,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the level of direct spending for that committee by $3,600,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 and outlays flowing therefrom.

(b) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.—

(1) FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.—(A) The Congress finds that—

(i) the Inspector General of the Department of Education has found that nearly 23 percent of recipients whose loans were discharged due to disability claims were gainfully employed;

(ii) based on data provided by the Office of Management and Budget, the House Committee on the Budget estimates that more than $8 billion in erroneous earned income tax payments are made each year;

(iii) the Office of Management and Budget estimates that erroneous payments for food stamps account for almost 9 percent of total benefits;

(iv) mismanagement of more than $3 billion in trust funds controlled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs led the Congress to take extraordinary measures to regain control of the these funds;

(v) in its Semiannual Reports to Congress, the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management has documented numerous instances of the Government continuing to make electronic payments for retirement benefits through the Civil Service Retirement System after the death of the eligible annuitants; and

(vi) numerous other examples of waste, fraud, and abuse are reported regularly by government watchdog agencies.

(B) It is, therefore, the purpose of this subsection to utilize the reconciliation process to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse in mandatory programs.

(2) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 18, 2003, the House committees named in paragraph (3) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget to carry out this subsection. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the

House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(3) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $600,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $5,532,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $18,618,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $261,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $2,596,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $9,421,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(C) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $2,397,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $25,265,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $107,359,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(D) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $62,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $678,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $2,864,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(E) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The House Committee on Government Reform shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,072,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $10,371,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $38,319,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013. For the purposes of this subparagraph and section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, a reduction in outlays submitted pursuant to this subparagraph that results from changes in programs within the jurisdiction of other committees shall count as a reduction in outlays for the Committee on Government Reform.

(F) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—The House Committee on House Administration shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $4,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $26,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $88,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(G) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.—The House Committee on International Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $157,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $1,293,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $4,468,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(H) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $86,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $727,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $2,404,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(I) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $40,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $345,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $1,105,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(J) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE.—The House Committee on Science shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $6,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $15,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(K) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $114,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $1,099,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $3,702,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(L) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $449,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $4,221,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $14,626,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(M) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,971,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $17,704,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $61,547,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds for Legislation Assumed in Budget Aggregates

SEC. 301. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE MODERNIZATION AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides a prescription drug benefit and modernizes medicare, and provides adjustments to the medicare program on a fee-for-service, capitated, or other basis, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the appropriate committee allocations described in subsection (c) for such committees and other appropriate levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed $7,500,000,000 in new budget authority and $7,500,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004 and $400,000,000,000 in new budget authority and $400,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(b) APPLICATION.—After the consideration of any measure for which an adjustment is made pursuant to subsection (a), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make any further appropriate adjustments in allocations and budget aggregates.

(c) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, there shall be a separate section 302(a) allocation to the appropriate committees for medicare. For purposes of enforcing such separate allocation under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the ''first fiscal year'' and the ''total of fiscal years'' shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2004 and the total of fiscal years 2004 through 2013 included in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution, respectively. Such separate allocation shall be the exclusive allocation for medicare under section 302(a) of such Act.

SEC. 302. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICAID.

In the House, if the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that—

(1) modernizes medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), and

(2) reduces new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom by $9,010,000,000 for fiscal years 2009 through 2013,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase allocations of new budget authority and outlays for that committee (and make other appropriate changes in budgetary aggregates) by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed $3,258,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2004 and $8,944,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008.

SEC. 303. RESERVE FUND FOR BIOSHIELD.

In the House, if the appropriate committee of jurisdiction reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes a program to accelerate the research, development, and purchase of biomedical threat countermeasures and—

(1) such measure provides new budget authority to carry out such program; or

(2) such measure authorizes discretionary new budget authority to carry out such program and the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution that provides new budget authority to carry out such program,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations for the committee providing such new budget authority, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, by the amount provided for that purpose, but, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (1), not to exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom and $3,418,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and outlays flowing therefrom or, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (2), not to exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the total such revision for fiscal year 2004 may not exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom.

Subtitle B—Contingency Procedure for Legislation Not Assumed in Budget Aggregates

SEC. 311. CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—In the House, if the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for the budget accounts or portions thereof in the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in excess of the following amounts:

(1) for fiscal year 2004: $39,135,000,000,

(2) for fiscal year 2005: $39,786,000,000,

(3) for fiscal year 2006: $40,502,000,000,

(4) for fiscal year 2007: $41,219,000,000, or

(5) for fiscal year 2008: $42,002,000,000,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate budget aggregates and increase the allocation of new budget authority to such committee for fiscal year 2004 and for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 to the extent such excess is offset by a reduction in mandatory outlays from the Highway Trust Fund or an increase in receipts appropriated to such fund for the applicable fiscal year caused by such legislation or any previously enacted legislation.

(b) ADJUSTMENT FOR OUTLAYS.—In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that changes obligation limitations such that the total limitations are in excess of $38,496,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, for programs, projects, and activities within the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and if legislation has been enacted that satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (a) for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays for such fiscal year for the committee reporting such measure by the amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a).

Subtitle C—Implementation

SEC. 321. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

(d) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, for the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution, sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall apply to fiscal year 2004 and the total for fiscal year 2004 and the four ensuing fiscal years.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE HOUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance appropriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) EXCEPTION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2005 and fiscal years 2005 and 2006 for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $23,178,000,000 in new budget authority.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2004 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2004.

SEC. 402. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No further amendment is in order except the amendments printed in part B of the report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House report 108–44.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. HILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 1 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. HILL:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 is hereby established and that the appropriate levels for fiscal years 2005 through 2013 are hereby set forth.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $1,441,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,604,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,746,972,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,863,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,981,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,099,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,226,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,460,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,637,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,778,210,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $30,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $12,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: −$6,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −$10,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −$18,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: −$21,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: −$33,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: −$33,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $0.
Fiscal year 2013: $0.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $1,843,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,951,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,071,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,171,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,276,515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,373,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,472,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,585,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,662,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,768,930,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $1,851,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,942,306,000.000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,045,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,140,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,249,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,355,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,461,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,586,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,653,413,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,776,371,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $409,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $337,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $298,326,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $276,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $267,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $256,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $234,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $125,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $15,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $−1,839,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $7,179,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $7,621,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $8,048,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $8,457,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $8,861,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $9,258,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $9,637,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $9,911,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $10,082,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $10,239,283,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $4,072,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $4,221,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $4,321,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $4,378,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $4,406,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $4,404,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $4,361,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $4,191,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $3,895,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,568,283,000,000.

SEC. 102. HOMELAND SECURITY.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 for Homeland Security are as follows:

(1) New budget authority, $41,035,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2004 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $400,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $420,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $440,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $460,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $438,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $480,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $462,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $494,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $480,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $507,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $497,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $522,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $516,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $536,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,884,000,000.
(A) New budget authority, $551,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,541,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $29,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $32,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $33,603,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $34,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $35,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $36,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $37,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $38,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $38,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,298,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $23,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $24,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $25,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $26,722,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $27,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $28,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $30,062,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,198,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $2,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $2,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $2,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $2,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,446,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $3,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,823,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $3,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,359,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $30,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $31,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,996,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $31,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $32,384,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $33,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $34,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $35,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $36,684,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $37,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $38,549,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,769,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $24,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,693,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $27,028,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $26,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $26,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $25,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,368,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,111,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $25,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $24,971,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $24,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $24,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,472,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $7,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,630,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $8,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $8,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $8,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $9,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $9,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $9,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,731,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $59,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $64,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,422,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $64,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $64,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $65,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $66,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $67,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $67,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $68,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $69,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,306,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,628,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $14,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $15,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,174,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $15,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $16,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $16,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $16,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $17,205,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,579,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $88,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $87,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $89,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $91,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $93,852,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $95,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $97,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,187,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $99,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $101,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $103,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,775,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $240,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $252,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $251,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $269,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $290,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $312,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $310,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $335,314,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $333,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $361,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $359,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $389,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $387,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $419,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $418,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $452,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $451,354,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $265,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $282,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $322,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $318,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $344,455,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $344,725,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $370,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $396,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $396,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $423,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $424,026,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $455,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $459,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $490,601,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $486,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $526,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,559,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $318,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $323,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $326,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $329,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $334,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $337,028,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $340,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $352,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $353,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $363,361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $364,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $375,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $376,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $392,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $392,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $383,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $384,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $398,184,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $398,881,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,502,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $16,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $18,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,999,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $22,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $24,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $31,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $34,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,670,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $61,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $67,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,612,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $65,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $64,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $67,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $69,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $71,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $75,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $72,923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $77,755,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,329,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $37,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $37,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $37,938,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $38,334,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $39,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $40,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $41,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $42,682,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $44,015,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $45,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,938,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $20,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $20,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $22,361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $23,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,121,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $253,189,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $293,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $325,488,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $329,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $344,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $351,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $360,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $375,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $386,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $387,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $401,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $397,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $401,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $422,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $397,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $425,508,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0
(B) Outlays, $0.0
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0
(B) Outlays, $0.0
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0
(B) Outlays, $0.0
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0
(B) Outlays, $0.0
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0
(B) Outlays, $0.0
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,116,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$6,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,040,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$45,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$45,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$55,509,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$55,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$57,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$57,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$52,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,206,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,753,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$56,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$56,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$58,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$58,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$61,522,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$61,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$66,358,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$66,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$68,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$68,977,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING ECONOMIC GROWTH.—(1) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill not later than April 11, 2003, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $46,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2003 and 2004 and increase the total level of revenues by not more than $49,900,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(2) It is the sense of the Congress that in complying with the instructions set forth in paragraph (1) the Committee on Ways and Means should provide immediate tax relief and economic stimulus by accelerating tax relief for middle-class families through increases in the child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, and reductions in individual income tax rates, provide incentives for business investment, provide immediate and permanent estate tax relief and defer tax relief for individual taxpayers with incomes above $140,000 until the budget is in balance and national security threats have been addressed.

(b) SUBMISSIONS REGARDING MEDICARE REFORM AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—Not later than July 18, 2003, the committees named in this subsection shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revisions.

(1) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reform medicare and provide a prescription drug benefit, such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $6,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004 and $400,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(2) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reform medicare and provide a prescription drug benefit, such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $6,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004 and $400,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

SEC. 202. INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT CONTINGENT UPON PLAN TO RESTORE BALANCED BUDGET.

(a) TEMPORARY INCREASE IN STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House shall report a bill as soon as practicable, but not later than April 11, 2003, that consists solely of changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the statutory debt limit by $150,000,000,000.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—(1) Except as provided by subsection (a) or paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the House to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that includes any provision that increases the limit on the public debt by more than $100,000,000,000.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the House if—

(A) the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House has made the certification described in section 203 that the unified budget will be in balance by fiscal year 2009; or

(B) the President has submitted to Congress a declaration that such increase is necessary to finance costs of a military conflict or address an imminent threat to national security, but which shall not exceed the amount of the adjustment under section 302 for the costs of military operations in Iraq.

SEC. 203. REVIEW OF BUDGET OUTLOOK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If, in the report released pursuant to section 202 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, entitled the Budget and Economic Outlook Update (for fiscal years 2004 through 2013), the Director of the Congressional Budget Office projects that the unified budget of the United States for fiscal year 2009 will be in balance, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House is authorized to certify that the budget is projected to meet the goals of a balanced budget.

(b) CALCULATING DISCRETIONARY SPENDING BASELINE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall use the discretionary spending levels set forth in this resolution, including any adjustments to such levels as a result of the implementation of any reserve funds set forth in this resolution to calculate the discretionary spending baseline.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND ENFORCEMENT

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds

SEC. 301. RESERVE FUND FOR HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for the Department of Homeland Security and if the Secretary of Homeland Security so requests, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Homeland Security should—

(1) conduct a homeland security needs assessment in consultation with all Federal agencies with responsibilities for homeland security and State and local governments; and

(2) submit a report to Congress with additional funding requests, if any, identified in the needs assessment, and that such report should also include a compilation of the needs assessments submitted by State and local governments.

SEC. 302. RESERVE FUND FOR THE COSTS OF MILITARY OPERATIONS IN IRAQ.

In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for the costs of military operations in Iraq, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose.

SEC. 303. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL MANDATORY FUNDING FOR EXISTING HEALTH AND EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WHICH PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND INDIVIDUALS.

In the House, if the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, or the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for additional mandatory funding for existing health and employment programs which provide assistance to States and individuals, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but such revision shall not exceed $12,500,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2008 and outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 304. RESERVE FUND FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for the budget accounts or portions thereof in the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in excess of the following amounts:

(1) for fiscal year 2004: $30,340,000,000,

(2) for fiscal year 2005: $30,998,000,000,

(3) for fiscal year 2006: $31,707,000,000,

(4) for fiscal year 2007: $32,436,000,000, or

(5) for fiscal year 2008: $33,190,000,000,

and the amount of such excess in each such year is offset by reductions in the deficit caused by such legislation or any previously enacted legislation that changes direct spending from, or receipts subsequently appropriated to, the Highway Trust Fund, the chairman of the Committee of the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority for such committee by the amount of such excess for fiscal year 2004 and by the total amount of such excesses for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and make the necessary offsetting adjustments in the appropriate budget aggregates and allocations.

(b) COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.—In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes obligation limitations that, in total, are in excess of $38,496,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a), for programs, projects, and activities within the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and if legislation has been enacted that satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (a) for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays for such fiscal year for the Committee on Appropriations by the amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations.

SEC. 305. RESERVE FUND FOR BIOSHIELD.

In the House, if the appropriate committee of jurisdiction reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes a program to accelerate the research, development, and purchase of biomedical threat countermeasures and—

(1) such measure provides new budget authority to carry out such program; or

(2) such measure authorizes discretionary new budget authority to carry out such program and the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution that provides new budget authority to carry out such program,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations for the committee providing such new budget authority, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, by the amount provided for that purpose, but, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (1), not to exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom and $3,418,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and outlays flowing therefrom or, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (2), not to exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the total such revision for fiscal year 2004 may not exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 306. RESERVE FUND FOR PERMANENT EXTENSION OF TAX CUTS; MEDICARE.

In the House, notwithstanding section 311 of this resolution, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that makes the provisions of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 permanent or provides additional resources for a medicare prescription drug benefit in excess of $400,000,000,000 over the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013, and if the chairman on the Committee on the Budget certifies that the enactment of such legislation would not cause or increase an on-budget deficit in 2013, then the chairman on the Committee on the Budget shall revise allocations to accommodate such legislation and make other necessary adjustments.

Subtitle B—Enforcement

SEC. 311. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN LEGISLATION REDUCING THE SURPLUS OR INCREASING THE DEFICIT AFTER FISCAL YEAR 2008.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that includes any provision that first provides new budget authority or a decrease in revenues for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2008 through fiscal year 2013 that would decrease the surplus or increase the deficit for any fiscal year.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House certifies, based on estimates prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, that Congress has enacted legislation restoring 75-year solvency of the Federal Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance Trust Fund and legislation extending the solvency of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for 20 years.

SEC. 312. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 313. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS IN THE HOUSE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto, that provides new budget authority that would cause the discretionary spending limits to be exceeded for any fiscal year.

(b) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—In the House and as used in this section, the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(8) with respect to fiscal year 2004—

(A) for the defense category: $399,683,000,000 in new budget authority and $389,746,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: $392,517,000,000 in new budget authority and $429,054,000,000 in outlays;

(9) with respect to fiscal year 2005—

(A) for the defense category: $420,019,000,000 in new budget authority and $409,737,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: $393,481,000,000 in new budget authority and $440,264,000,000 in outlays;

(10) with respect to fiscal year 2006—

(A) for the defense category: $440,044,000,000 in new budget authority and $422,808,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: $402,256,000,000 in new budget authority and $446,992,000,000;

(11) with respect to fiscal year 2007—

(A) for the defense category: $460,309,000,000 in new budget authority and $436,164,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: $412,091,000,000 in new budget authority and $455,236,000,000;

(12) with respect to fiscal year 2008—

(A) for the defense category: $480,747,000,000 in new budget authority and $460,190,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: $494,853,000,000 in new budget authority and $465,710,000,000;

as adjusted in conformance with subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) CHAIRMAN.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution, the offering of an amendment thereto, or the submission of a conference report thereon, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the adjustments set forth in subparagraph (B) for the amount of new budget authority in that measure (if that measure meets the requirements set forth in paragraph (2)) and the outlays flowing from that budget authority. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may also make appropriate adjustments for the reserve funds set forth in sections 301, 302, and 303.

(B) MATTERS TO BE ADJUSTED.—The adjustments referred to in subparagraph (A) are to be made to—

(i) the discretionary spending limits, if any, set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget;

(ii) the allocations made pursuant to the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(iii) the budgetary aggregates as set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) AMOUNTS OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) an amount provided and designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 314;

(B) an amount appropriated for homeland security as provided in section 301;

(C) an amount appropriated for military operations in Iraq as provided in section 302; and

(D) an amount provided for transportation under section 304.

(3) APPLICATION OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustments made for legislation pursuant to paragraph (1) shall—

(A) apply while that legislation is under consideration;

(B) take effect upon the enactment of that legislation; and

(C) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(4) APPLICATION OF THIS SECTION.—The provisions of this section shall apply to legislation providing new budget authority for fiscal years 2003 through 2008.

(d) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—(1) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of this section.

(2)(A) This subsection shall apply only to the House of Representatives.

(B) In order to be cognizable by the Chair, a point of order under this section must specify the precise language on which it is premised.

(C) As disposition of points of order under this section, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the points of order.

(D) A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by each Member initiating a point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent on each point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

(E) The disposition of the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to a bill or joint resolution shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.

SEC. 314. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—If a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation is enacted or if appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that the President designates as an emergency requirement and that the Congress so designates in statute, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be designated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this resolution.

(b) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under subsection (a), the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets all the criteria in paragraph (2).

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The criteria to be considered in determining whether a proposed expenditure or tax change is an emergency requirement are that the expenditure or tax change is—

(i) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(ii) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(iii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iv) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(v) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(3) JUSTIFICATION FOR USE OF DESIGNATION.—When an emergency designation is proposed in any bill, joint resolution, or conference report thereon, the committee report and the statement of managers accompanying a conference report, as the case may be, shall provide a written justification of why the provision meets the criteria set forth in paragraph (2).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''direct spending'', ''receipts'', and ''appropriations for discretionary accounts'' means any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that provides direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) SEPARATE HOUSE VOTE ON EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—(1) In the House, in the consideration of any measure for amendment in the Committee of the Whole containing any emergency spending designation, it shall always be in order unless specifically waived by terms of a rule governing consideration of that measure, to move to strike such emergency spending designation from the portion of the bill then open to amendment.

(2) The Committee on Rules shall include in the report required by clause 1(d) of rule XI (relating to its activities during the Congress) of the Rules of House of Representatives a separate item identifying all waivers of points of order relating to emergency spending designations, listed by bill or joint resolution number and the subject matter of that measure.

(e) COMMITTEE NOTIFICATION OF EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.—Whenever the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee of either House (including a committee of conference) reports any bill or joint resolution that provides budget authority for any emergency, the report accompanying that bill or joint resolution (or the joint explanatory statement of managers in the case of a conference report on any such bill or joint resolution) shall identify all provisions that provide budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom for such emergency and include a statement of the reasons why such budget authority meets the definition of an emergency pursuant to the guidelines described in subsection (b).

(f) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under this section against a conference report, the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(g) EXCEPTION FOR DEFENSE AND HOMELAND SECURITY SPENDING.—Subsection (d) shall not apply against an emergency designation for a provision making discretionary appropriations in the defense category and for homeland security programs.

SEC. 315. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any one of the three applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''applicable time period'' means any 1 of the 3 following periods:

(A) The first year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(B) The period of the first 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(C) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the first 5 fiscal years covered in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) DIRECT-SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as

provided in paragraph (4), the term ''direct-spending legislation'' means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms ''direct-spending legislation'' and ''revenue legislation'' do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget;

(B) any reconciliation bill reported pursuant to section 201 of this resolution;

(C) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990; or

(D) any legislation for which an adjustment is made under section 302.

(5) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this section shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget as adjusted for any changes in revenues or direct spending assumed by such resolution; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) PRIOR SURPLUS.—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted pursuant to reconciliation instructions since the beginning of that same calendar year shall not be available.

(b) APPEALS.—Appeals in the House from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be.

(c) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House.

(d) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—(1) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of this section.

(2)(A) This subsection shall apply only to the House of Representatives.

(B) In order to be cognizable by the Chair, a point of order under this section must specify the precise language on which it is premised.

(C) As disposition of points of order under this section, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the points of order.

(D) A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by each Member initiating a point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent on each point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

(E) The disposition of the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to a bill or joint resolution shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.

(e) SUNSET.—This section shall expire on September 30, 2008.

SEC. 316. DISCLOSURE OF EFFECT OF LEGISLATION ON THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Each report of a committee of the House on a public bill or public joint resolution shall contain an estimate by the committee of the amount the public debt would be increased (including related debt service costs) in carrying out the bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is reported and in the 5-fiscal year period beginning with such fiscal year (or for the authorized duration of any program authorized by the bill or joint resolution if less than five years).

SEC. 317. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST COSTS.

Whenever a committee of either House of Congress reports to its House legislation providing new budget authority or providing an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures, the report accompanying that bill or joint resolution shall contain a projection by the Congressional Budget Office of the cost of the debt servicing that would be caused by such measure for such fiscal year (or fiscal years) and each of the 4 ensuing fiscal years.

SEC. 318. DYNAMIC SCORING OF TAX LEGISLATION.

Any report of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of any bill or joint resolution reported by that committee that proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and which report includes an estimate prepared by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation pursuant to clause 2(h)(2) of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall also contain an estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office regarding the macroeconomic effect of any increase or decrease in the estimated budget deficit resulting from such bill or joint resolution.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted enforcing this resolution by—

(1) setting discretionary spending limits for budget authority and outlays at the levels set forth in this resolution for each of the next 5 fiscal years;

(2) reinstating the pay-as-you-go rules set forth in section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for the next 10 fiscal years;

(3) requiring separate votes to exceed such discretionary spending limits or to waive such pay-as-you-go rules;

(4) establishing a definition for emergency spending and requiring a justification for emergency spending requests and legislation; and

(5) establishing expedited rescission authority regarding congressional votes on rescission submitted by the President and reducing discretionary spending limits to reflect savings from any rescissions enacted into law.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TAX REFORM.

It is the sense of Congress that the Committee on Ways and Means should—

(1) work with the Secretary of the Treasury to draft legislation reforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in a revenue-neutral manner to improve savings and investment; and

(2) consider changes that address the treatment of dividends and retirement savings, corporate tax avoidance, and simplification of the tax laws.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to myself as much time as I may consume.

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dog plan that we are offering today combines short-term economic stimulus and immediate tax relief for all taxpayers with long-term fiscal discipline to balance the budget by 2009 and return to saving the Social Security surplus by 2013. The Blue Dog budget has nearly $2 trillion less debt than the President's budget from the year 2003 to 2013. The Blue Dog budget calls for tough spending limits by adopting the President's overall spending levels but does not rely on unreasonable or unrealistic spending cuts from the President's proposal.

The Blue Dog budget will hold Congress accountable for the increase in the debt tax by limiting increases in the debt limit and requiring regular votes by Congress to raise the debt limit until the budget is on the path towards balance.

We strongly support the President in the war on terrorism and in keeping a strong defense. Our budget provides the President with everything he requested for defense and homeland security and sets aside a reserve fund for additional funding for homeland security if the administration requests it. The Blue Dog budget is good policy, plain and simple. For every $1,000 each taxpayer sends to Washington, an income tax roughly $180 goes to pay the interest on our national debt. The Blue Dog budget reduces that burden while the Republican budget increases that burden. That is what we call the ''debt tax.'' Eighteen percent of the Federal budget, over $2,500 per person, over $4,000 per family, and it only gets worse if we follow their plan. Bob Dole called it the stealth tax in 1996. It was mentioned in a 1995 Republican-authored resolution, and it was referenced in the first plank of the 1994 Republican Contract with America.

The debt tax is money that goes towards nothing, and it is a tax that cannot be repealed. It does not make our Nation stronger. It does not make health care more affordable. It does not make our schools better. It does not provide more jobs, and it surely does not make our economy more robust.

It is time to get back on the track towards balancing the Federal budget. We cannot and should not send our troops, our brave men and women, into battle, then saddle them with the bill. It is not the right thing to do, and everybody in this body knows it. The Blue Dog budget will restore fiscal responsibility, stability, and accountability to Federal budgeting process. A great American from the great State of Tennessee once said that no nation has ever been free, strong, and broke.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as I may consume. I respectfully claim the time in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, obviously I support the work of the committee, the underlying resolution, the budget resolution that is forwarded today. I want to thank the Blue Dog Coalition for coming forth with yet another budget proposal this year. I believe this is a consistent track record for the Blue Dogs in providing a budget resolution for consideration. We will disagree with that budget here today as they disagree with our budget, but I want to start by complimenting them because even last year at a time when the minority did not come forward with a caucus position, the Blue Dogs did. And the so-called Blue Dogs in this instance have done so again and I want to respect that. Only people who have actually gone through the process of writing a budget know how difficult that task can be in making some of the choices one has to make in order to arrive at this.

I disagree with their approach, however, for a number of reasons. First of all, I do not believe what they are putting forward supports our economy. I believe what we need right now is a growth package. The President has put that forward. We indicated that the second most important part of our budget is providing growth to the economy to create jobs. We believe we need tax simplification. We believe we need tax reform. We believe we need to lower the tax on the American people at a time of recession, not just for the sake of lowering taxes but because we know, we have seen this happen in the past many times in history where when we reduce the tax burden on America, when we reduce it particularly to a level at or below the average of taxes and revenues compared to the gross domestic product, that that does have a growth effect, a stimulative effect, on the economy.

And so while we will agree today on national defense and homeland security, probably the biggest departure we will see between these two budgets is regarding growth in the economy and creating jobs. We just happen to believe on our side that getting a growth package through to create jobs is vitally important. We are also going to have a semantical debate here today. I do not want to throw gasoline on the fire, so I am going to try not to. But I have to say that if we are not going to continue an already-reduced reduction in taxes, I mean I do not know what we call that. I know many on my side have come down here and I know it makes my friends in the Blue Dog Coalition cringe when they hear it when we have heard on our side that that be explained as a tax increase, but you might be able to understand why you cringe when you see us cringe when a reduction in the anticipated increase is called a cut.

And time after time today we have seen Members come to the floor on the other side of the aisle and explain that we are making excruciating cuts in veterans and education and Medicare and Medicaid and all sorts of different programs when in fact that is simply not the case. One not only cannot find it within our budget document, but in fact that is not the choice that we request. What we request is that we go through the budget and we look for waste, fraud, and abuse and places where we have been spending money we did not have to, and we do not have all of them but these are just some examples that you do not ask us to go after: Foreign Assistance, the Effectiveness and Accountability of Problems Common to U.S. Programs, Taking Strategic Approach for DOD and the Acquisition of Services, Implementation of an Electronic Benefit Transfer System in the Food Stamp Program, IRS's Efforts to Improve Compliance with the Employment Tax.

I mean, all of these save money. All of these find places where we are just not doing a good job. All of these ought to be a hearing. All of these ought to be a place where we can introduce legislation and we can say that is not a cut. To go through this and to actually look at the General Accounting Office, and we pay them a lot of money. Talk about waste. If you are going to hire people to go through the programs from the General Accounting Office and then you do not even listen to them, my friend, the comptroller general, would not like my saying this, but why do we hire these folks to give us these good ideas of places we can reduce spending, not cutting benefits, not cutting services, not closing nursing homes, not cutting off senior citizens, not eliminating Meals on Wheels or food stamps or school lunches or, oh, my goodness, all of the things that people have come down here wringing their hands about today, but just going through here: Controlling the Weakness in Property Vulnerable to Improper Use, Loss and Theft. There is a real partisan issue, theft. I mean if we are stealing things from agencies, from departments, and I have heard everything from a 61-inch television; I mean, come on.

Does that balance the budget? No. We are not suggesting that alone balances the budget, but we have got to start somewhere.

I could go on. The Deteriorating Financial Outlook and the Need for Transformation in the Postal Service, Medicare, Medicaid, FAA. Here is one, let us see, Significant Weakness in the Computer Controls. And, in fact, I believe we spent $8 million trying to get the Department of Agriculture to go to a new computer system; and guess what, after I think 8 years and $8 million, they found out they could not go to the new system. So we just spent $8 million for nothing on that. Defense Acquisitions, Debt Collection, Food Stamps. Again, there is another one. But if we even look at food stamps, people will say we are somehow throwing the poor out in the street. Medicare, here we go again. Boy, do not touch Medicare, though. Do not even look there. Heaven forbid. It must be a perfect program. Just add more benefits, and it will be fine. I mean, we could go on and on. They are replete. I have got a whole pile over on this side. You do not look at that. And that is an important area where we believe it is time to challenge the committees to do the work to find the savings.

Last but not least, I believe that it is time that we do something together around here, and that is enforce the budget. I know that we are going to disagree today on a number of these topics. The thing that is so frustrating is when time after time Members, and it happens in the Blue Dogs, it happens on our side as well, where we come down here, we talk about our budgets and then during the appropriations process we blow through those things. We find different ways to come through the process without holding to the budget that we agreed to. I would hope that my friends in the Blue Dog Coalition more than anybody else, and I know they do, believe that once we have a budget, it is time to enforce it because if we cannot even enforce that, having this debate today is going to be meaningless.

So as I started off with today, we do not support just allowing these tax cuts to expire. We happen to believe that does increase the tax burden. We want to make sure that we have spending restraint. You claim to do it with interest payments; but we want to do it with actual spending, not just with interest payments; and we want to make sure that we figure out a way to grow the economy and create jobs. And for those reasons I respectfully oppose the Blue Dog budget, but wish them congratulations on actually creating one which is something that many people around here claim they want to do, but do not always accomplish.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, but I want to use a portion of my time commending him, but I wanted to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. NUSSLE. What?

Mr. STENHOLM. I will when it comes my time, but I will do it on my own time, but I am curious because it seems to me over the last 8 years you talk about your party has been in control. So all of the points that you make with the blue books, why have we not done it?

□ 1730

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I can tell the gentleman why. It is a frustration of mine, and it is the reason why I put the budget out that I did this year.

When we got to surplus, and we have seen the chart, when we got to balancing and began going into surplus, particularly into discretionary spending, all of us around here very cheerfully started getting into a bidding war. We could do a little better than you in education, you could do a little better than us in health care. We went on and on and on.

Look at the charts in any of those categories. Once 1998 happened, as my friend knows, we could not say no to anything. It was very difficult to try to control that. That is just the discretionary side, which, as the gentleman knows, is only one-quarter of the budget.

On the mandatory side, think of the last time in a partisan or bipartisan way that we tried to take on an entitlement and even tried to control spending. My friend has quite a bit of control or interest in agriculture, as do I. I sit on a committee that has jurisdiction over Medicare and welfare. We did it in welfare and had some real success.

I just want us to start looking at that process again. That is the reason in this budget I challenge the committees. I do not do it myself. I do not try and tell my good friend on the Committee on Agriculture exactly where that ought to come from. But I do challenge him to look at the reports on food stamps and others and say, can we not do a better job?

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, I do not want to leave the impression that the Blue Dog budget is doing anything more than spending what President Bush has asked the Congress to spend, not 1 penny more.

We sometimes get the rhetoric around here, you would think we are big spenders in our budget. We are spending what the President has asked us to spend, and no more.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is a good point. But that is just the first year. We believe that we need to continue to control that spending in the outyears as well.

We also believe, and that is the reason why the budget was presented the way it was, that the President had some areas where we could control. This was true with President Clinton, President Reagan, President Bush, with all of them.

Congress is responsible for controlling spending under Article I of the Constitution. We like to blame the fellow down the street, but, more often than not, it is the people that we look at every day in the mirror that can do the best job at controlling spending.

As I say, I compliment the gentleman and my friends for putting together a budget. We respectfully disagree with that budget for the reasons that I state.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear more from my friends in the coalition.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to urge my colleagues to support the Blue Dog budget plan, a fiscally responsible proposal that recognizes America's priorities at a time when our country is at war and our Nation is in debt.

The budget resolution before us today is seriously flawed. It is a step in the wrong direction that ignores the realities we are facing as a Nation. The Blue Dog budget, on the other hand, recognizes the costs of waging war, addresses the state of our struggling economy, and answers the needs of ordinary Americans across the Nation.

As we speak, men and women in uniform are fighting to disarm Iraq and are battling al Qaeda in Afghanistan. Hundreds of thousands are now serving their country after being called up, leaving their jobs and their families, many on short notice and at great financial and personal costs. Our troops are indeed making huge sacrifices.

But what about the average American who is not on Active Duty or in the Reserves? How have the rest of us been called upon to make our own contribution to the security and prosperity of the United States? The budget resolution before us includes a host of large tax cuts weighted heavily toward America's wealthiest families. Certainly this cannot be the sacrifice we are expected to make.

In every other conflict since the Civil War, the Commander in Chief has called for an increase in revenues to meet the national defense. Will we be the first generation since the Civil War to reduce revenue during wartime?

Over the last 2 years we have lost almost 2 million jobs. How can we afford to consider large and long-term cuts that will neither improve our defense, stimulate our economy, nor help those most in need?

Many of us who supported tax cuts when we were at peace and enjoying historic surpluses must now oppose any fiscally irresponsible budget with even larger cuts, now that we are at war and spiraling into severe debt. I must ask, where have all the fiscal conservatives gone? Where have they fled from the majority party?

In addition to the much-needed stimulus, the Blue Dog plan prioritizes national defense and homeland security. These priorities are fully funded at levels requested by the President.

While we provide strong support for our national defense and homeland security, we must not turn our backs on important domestic priorities. The American people are begging for a budget that invests in education, health care, and includes a Medicare prescription drug benefit. The Blue Dog plan responds to Americans across the country and provides a $400 billion plan for prescription drugs over the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, this plan, the Blue Dog plan, will provide for our defense and homeland security needs, it will provide a vital economic stimulus and sustainable tax relief for ordinary Americans, and the plan will move our country forward with investments in health, education and other domestic priorities. Our plan will accomplish these goals and achieve $2 trillion less in debt than the administration's plan over the next 10 years.

Americans are a proud and generous people, more than willing to sacrifice for a worthy cause. If, instead, we give ourselves a gift no other war generation has given themselves, we will denude our ability to defend the homeland, or shift the costs to the next generation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD), a new Member, and a fine one at that.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Blue Dog budget. As a cochair of the Blue Dog Caucus, I was proud to work with my colleagues on this fine proposal. In my 22 years as a State legislator in Maine, I have always delivered a balanced budget, and I can tell you that the Blue Dog budget is a great budget.

My time is brief, so I just want to make three vital points about the Blue Dog approach.

First, this budget is balanced. We achieve a $15 billion surplus by the year 2009, and we have $2 trillion less in debt over the next 10 years than the President's budget.

Today we spend 18 cents of every dollar on servicing our debt. What a waste of money. This is a debt tax that every American pays, 18 cents on every hard-earned dollar.

We balance the budget and control the debt. The Blue Dog approach reduces waste, and it lowers the taxes that we all pay. Now, that is a tax cut that we all can agree on.

Second, this budget is fair. It funds defense at the same level as the President, it gives tax relief to everyone, and it includes $60 billion in immediate economic stimulus, including desperately needed assistance to States, States like the State of Maine, which the Committee on the Budget does not provide for.

Third, this budget is just. The Committee on the Budget resolution cuts mandatory spending in many areas. One of the most unconscionable cuts is a $15 billion reduction for veteran programs. On the very day we go to war, how can we vote to neglect our veterans like this?

Not only does the Blue Dog budget restore these cuts, but it also restores other funding to vital domestic programs like education, child care, dislocated workers programs and homeland security, and it does all of this within a balanced budget.

I say to my colleagues that this is not a party issue, it is not a political issue. This is about keeping our commitments, investing in our priorities and meeting our responsibilities.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reach across the line that sometimes divides us and unite today for a budget that is balanced, that is fair and that is just.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), a great American.

(Mr. TANNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dog budget is based on a very simple premise that basically says that our generation needs to be willing to have the courage to pay the bills that we are incurring and not pass this staggering debt on to our children.

As hard as this may be to imagine, we the people of the United States of America owe $6.4 trillion. If we follow the budget plan that the majority has put forward, that number will balloon to $10 trillion, and our country will be unable to meet its obligations. Can you imagine the richest country on Earth dead broke?

Eight months ago Congress increased the debt ceiling by $450 billion to pay for additional spending and tax cuts. Now the Treasury Department has notified us that we have reached this new debt limit, and it will have to be increased in the coming weeks.

It gets even worse. The Congressional Budget Office recently reported that the deficit for this year will be $287 billion, and that is without paying any cost of the war that has begun in Iraq. They also predicted over the next 10 years another $2 trillion of debt will be piled onto what we have already incurred.

Last year taxpayers in this country paid an accrued $332 billion in interest on revenues of $1.8 trillion. That amounts to a Federal debt tax on American families of 18 cents on every dollar. Said another way, we have an 18 percent mortgage on this country, and it is growing.

Notwithstanding the moral arguments of what we are doing to the next generation of Americans, at some point, in order to make the public investment needed to keep a world-class military, a healthy and educated workforce, and the bricks-and-mortar infrastructure that enables private enterprise in this country to flourish, we must stop deficit spending.

People since the dawn of civilization have tried to borrow themselves rich. It never worked then, and it will not work now, and it will not work in the future. That is exactly the prescription that the Republicans are asking us to follow; we can borrow ourselves rich. It will never happen.

We must stop the hemorrhaging, the hemorrhaging, from the Federal Treasury, because it is bleeding from every pore of our body. Any rational person understands that this business plan for our country is not a tenable plan and cannot be sustained over time.

Now, here we are debating today what direction our country will take. This plan includes no cuts in the veterans' programs that some have talked about. But it does something else. At this moment when our men and women in uniform are in battle, they are the only people in this society being asked to sacrifice anything, anything, and that is absolutely unfair. It is not only unfair, it is immoral. So what we have done in the Blue Dog plan is we have asked the most financially well-to-do people in this country to defer the additional tax cuts they get in addition to everybody else under our plan, we have asked them to defer their additional tax cuts in order to help pay for this war so that we do not continue to dig this hole deeper.

Now, I agree with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) on one thing: When you say in Washington, and only in Washington, that an increase is considered a cut because it is not a projected increase, then it is considered a cut here, that is baloney, and I agree with the gentleman. I will also tell the gentleman that when you try to accuse somebody of raising taxes on a tax cut that is not yet effective, that is equally political baloney, and everybody knows it.

I just would say this: Something has got to be done. We cannot continue down this road of debt, more debt and more debt. And if we do not do something about it, we have completely abdicated our responsibility not only to our country today, but to our country tomorrow. That is why I would urge every Member who worries about the financial condition of this country and its ability to maintain the world-class military that we all desire and all of the other things I have talked about, please consider voting for and supporting the Blue Dog budget.

□ 1745

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), the strongest voice in this House about the era of Federal budget deficits.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, before anyone thinks that I am trying to impress upon them that I am a biblical scholar, I will tell my colleagues I am not, but I happened to listen to one Sunday evening. His name is Father Dennis Carver, and he was in Pass Christian, Mississippi. He was talking about a civilization called the Babylonians. They were apparently a very prosperous civilization, but one of the things that was unique about them is that for the sake of their prosperity, they would literally take their children, put them on an alter, and slit their throats.

Although the gentleman from Iowa's budget does not quite do that, I will say that it is fair to say that we are burdening our children with so much debt that they cannot possibly hope to attain the sort of lifestyle that we have, or remain the world's greatest Nation.

In 1994, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, gave a speech on this House floor bemoaning the fact that at the time, every American man, woman, and child was $17,000 in debt as a portion of the national debt. The Republicans took over in 1995. I had hoped things would get better. But since 1995 through today, that same statistic is that every American man, woman, and child is now in debt $22,000. The Republicans have been in charge, the Republican Party. I had hoped they were truly fiscal conservatives. They have proven otherwise.

If we look at American history, during every single war in American history, and I challenge all of my colleagues to question me on this and look it up for themselves, in every other war in American history, they raised taxes to pay for that war. They took the attitude that those of us who were fortunate enough not to be in the front lines, not to be shot at, not to watch our comrades maimed, ought to at least be willing to pay for that. But there is a difference. Only this generation of Americans is saying that we are going to fight a war, we are going to occupy the nation of Iraq for at least 10 years, with a starting force of 100,000 people as occupiers, but, by the way, we are going to stick these young people in this room and the young people back in Mississippi, the young people in Texas, we are going to stick them with the bill, knowing that they will never have a chance to recover from that and they will continue to squander at least $1 billion a day every day of our lives as a Nation on interest on that debt.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and other members of the Blue Dog Coalition have done an admirable job of saying, we have to do better. And I have to tell my colleagues, I am going to vote for the Blue Dog budget, but I would have been willing to vote for any budget that freezes all of the tax cuts, because it is simply not fair.

Two years ago, the gentleman from Iowa and others came to this floor and said the President's tax breaks would not increase the national debt. I say to my colleagues they were $802 billion wrong. At what point do they admit to their mistakes, and at what point do they stop the bleeding?

The Federal debt is still growing. On February 28, 2003, the public debt was $6,445,790,102,794.08.

The public debt has increased by more than $802 billion since Congress passed the President's first budget plan on May 9, 2001. The debt grew $442,337,086,210.23 in the 12 months from February 28, 2002 to February 28, 2003.

There is no surplus except in trust funds. In the first four months of fiscal year 2003, the Treasury reported a budget deficit of $97.6 billion. However, the trust funds for Social Security, Medicare, military retirement, and federal employees retirement collected $90.2 billion in surpluses to fund future benefits. Outside these trust funds, the federal government ran a deficit of $187.8 billion.

During fiscal year 2002, Social Security added $159 billion to its surplus, and the trust funds for Medicare, military retirement, and federal employee retirement added to total of $68 billion in surplus funds. Outside those trust funds, the federal government ran a deficit of $386 billion. The Congressional Budget Office reported that fiscal year 2002 had the largest percentage decrease in revenues in 56 years and the largest percentage increase in spending in 20 years.

We spend almost one billion dollars per day on interest. The Treasury spent $332.5 billion on interest on the debt in fiscal year 2002. Military spending totaled $332.1 billion, slightly less than the interest expense, despite a 14 percent increase to fight the war on terrorism. Medicare spending totaled $256 billion, $77 billion less than we spent on interest.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes just to show my colleague from Mississippi, who does care about this; I do not begrudge him that at all. I just want to let him know that I also share in the concern over debt. But since he was slightly partisan about the issue, let me show my colleagues my chart that shows the difference between what the Democratic Congresses did versus the Republican Congresses.

We were the ones who paid down the national debt by almost half a trillion dollars until we hit this last crisis in 2001 involving the economy, involving the emergency spending, involving what happened with homeland security. Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues want to raise it to a partisan level of whose debt is whose, I can show my colleagues a chart that compares with the gentleman's partisan chart.

What I would rather do is say, look, we are in this together now. I can show a chart that goes back to Reagan. I can show a chart that goes back to Clinton. We can have a history lesson here all day long. We can yell and scream and point fingers at who did what.

Look, we are in a mess. My colleagues did not do it; I did not do it. I mean, there are three huge factors. We had emergency spending that no one, no one would have ever anticipated. What a huge economic sucker gut punch as a result of a recession that was made worse after 2001 and the terrorist attacks. Was there a component part of that of reducing taxes? Yes. We disagree. We deliberately reduced taxes at a time of huge surpluses because, yes, we were paying off the national debt, paid off over a half a trillion dollars of national debt.

So if my colleagues want to come down and point fingers and talk about the past, I can show my colleagues Reagan charts and Clinton charts and things like that.

I think we should talk about the future and what we are going to do about it. The Democrats have a plan. I compliment that plan, even though I disagree with it, because it does begin to address those issues. I have what we believe is a better plan. But let us talk about our plan and let us look forward. If my colleagues want to continue to point fingers on how we got here, my colleagues can take up the time for the substitute to do just that, but I believe we ought to focus on the future and what we are going to do about it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, America is at war, and the Blue Dog budget reflects this new reality.

Our plan strengthens national defense, improves homeland security, all in the context of a responsible budget.

I have always tried to support my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when they were right, but today their budget is all wrong.

In an effort to squeeze the President's tax cut package into their budget, our Republican colleagues have proposed spending levels below the President's that are highly unlikely to be attainable in the current climate of war and the need to protect the homeland from terrorism. And even after cutting the President's budget, the Republican budget continues to dig the deficit hole deeper, saddling the taxpayers of this country with a national debt of over $11.5 trillion in 2013. That is an increase of $5.1 trillion in debt in the next 10 years. That means every American taxpayer will owe approximately $5,100 every year just to pay the interest on the national debt. That is a debt tax that cannot be repealed.

In contrast, the Blue Dog budget is a realistic effort to control runaway Federal spending. It adopts the spending recommendations of our President. The Republican budget, on the other hand, turns its back on their own President's spending recommendations for veterans benefits, Medicare, Social Security, agriculture, and education.

The Blue Dog budget puts us back on a path to a unified balance by 2009 and restores the Social Security lockbox by 2013, a very significant year, because in that year, for the first time, the Social Security Administration projects that our government will begin paying out more each month in benefits than we received in payroll taxes.

By contrast, the Republican budget never restores the Social Security lockbox, turning their back on a promise made to America's seniors.

Since the Blue Dog budget adopts the total spending levels in the President's budget, my colleagues may be asking, what does the Blue Dog budget do differently than the Republican budget? It differs in one significant respect. It recognizes that long-term national security requires long-term fiscal responsibility. No nation has ever been strong and broke.

When our budget policies show that our current tax and spending plans will lead our Nation to ever-increasing debt, we are weakening our ability to respond to national security threats. At this very moment, while young men and women in uniform are courageously fighting the enemy in the deserts of Iraq, we are charging the financial cost of the war to the Federal Government's credit card. Who in this Chamber can explain to the American people why we are charging the cost of this war to the very generation that is now fighting this war? The Blue Dogs believe our generation should pay for this war.

Our Republican friends say, deficits no longer matter, and tax cuts will stimulate the economy, and tax revenues will return. We tried that in 2001 and what did we get? We saw the economy decline and a $5 trillion surplus disappear into thin air.

The Blue Dogs invite our Republican friends not to bet the whole farm on an ideologically driven supply-side economic theory, but join us in accelerating the marginal tax relief, accelerating the child tax credit, accelerating the elimination of the marriage penalty; but in the name of fiscal responsibility and national security, we should not accelerate the tax cuts for those families who have over $170,000 a year in income. Surely the top 3 percent of America's families will be proud to share in the patriotism of making this small sacrifice as those young men and women are doing in Iraq today.

We know that we should not ask those men and women in uniform to pay for the war we have called on them to fight. I invite all true fiscal conservatives to support the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time. I will be very brief.

I have a great deal of admiration for the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the committee. He has brought a budget resolution to the floor that his leadership has allowed him to bring, and they think they can get 218 votes out of the Republican caucus. What is wrong with that? I will tell my colleagues what is wrong with that and what the American people will say is wrong with that, and that is that the American people expect this Congress to set its priorities and to pay for those priorities, and that is something that we have been unwilling to do in the last couple of years.

What do I mean by that? It means that we have to have discipline on the spending side. We had that in 1997 when we, in a bipartisan way, sat down with the administration, which was in Democratic hands, and we sat down with the Republican-controlled Senate and House and made an agreement to set spending caps, and we made an agreement to get this budget into balance by 2003, and we did it 3 years ahead of schedule.

So I would encourage my colleagues to vote for the Blue Dog budget and reject the Republican budget.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time.

I want to announce and show the audience here in the Chamber that the Concord Coalition, which is a national watchdog organization on the budget, issued a press statement today; and I want to just quote briefly from that:

''The Blue Dog budget does the best job of balancing short term concerns with long term fiscal discipline. The Blue Dog budget is clearly superior to the alternatives. It strikes a prudent balance among competing priorities by restraining spending and limiting newer expanded tax cuts to those that have an immediate impact and minimum long term cost.''

□ 1800

I hope we will set aside partisanship and listen to a respected, objective organization, the national coalition, and approve the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman Nussle) for his commitment to providing a balanced budget and for acknowledging that debt and deficits do matter.

The Committee on the Budget passed a budget last week on a party line vote. At least it was an honest budget. It said that in order for us to pass huge tax cuts when we are already projecting deficits as far as the eye can see, we must pass spending cuts. In deference to Mr. Chairman over here, he would say, find savings in all functions of government. So please understand it that way.

Over $100 billion below the President's request for discretionary spending, $262 billion in Medicare cuts are finding savings, $110 billion in Medicaid cuts are savings, $19 billion in agriculture cuts are savings, $39 billion in government employees' pensions, and $15 billion in veterans benefits at a time that we are going to war, when our domestic security is threatened and our States and local governments are in financial crisis. That is the problem with this budget, Mr. Chairman: The reductions proposed simply are not reality.

Everyone here remembers last year's appropriations process. We just completed it last month. Congress ended up spending, or appropriating, $12 billion more than the President's recommended levels. This budget proposes cuts in the President's austere request. This budget, simply for that reason, I believe, with all respect to the chairman and the committee, is not reality.

Look at what has happened the last weeks. In the face of an outright revolt on many of these cuts, what did the majority do? They restored some of the so-called spending cuts, or savings, that were found, about $200 billion in Medicare over 10 years. That is what is going to happen more and more. That is why I believe we simply cannot meet the spending levels proposed, with all respect, by the majority's budget.

This budget, because of its emphasis on tax cuts, never, I repeat, never, gets us to on-budget balance. Instead, it increases gross debt by over $5 trillion over the next 10 years. The structural deficits in this budget, Mr. Chairman, will explode gross interest payments to $3.8 trillion during the next decade. Interest, as has already been mentioned, it is the most wasteful spending we have because it commits our future generations in this country, our children and grandchildren, to paying something, a tax, what we call a debt tax.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) indicated that Senator DOLE called this a stealth tax. We call it a debt tax. It is a tax that can never be repealed because it is the interest of service on the national debt.

The Blue Dog budget cuts taxes. It provides an income tax cut for all taxpayers. It immediately eliminates the marriage penalty, accelerates the child tax credit, and on and on. Listen to the Concord Coalition, the objective voice here, endorsing the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the budget of the Blue Dogs, which I think handles our short-term needs and our long-term concerns.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Iowa for his hard work on the committee, and to thank him for allowing the Blue Dogs to make this presentation here today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I have waited 24 years for this day to shuck the tax-and-spend Democratic label and transfer it to the Republican borrow-and-spend label. I say this with a smile on my face, and I am one of those that believe when I am pointing the finger of partisanship, there are always three pointing back at me. I will take the three best shots of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), but I insist the gentleman takes my one at this time.

The gentleman said we have a difference between our two philosophies today. This chart shows it. Our budget is the green budget. The yellow budget I ran against in 1978 because I thought deficit spending was bad. I voted for the Reagan tax cuts; and this is what we got, following the same economic theory that we once again are being asked to support today.

I am for the green. The Blue Dog budget will accomplish that based on the estimates. The gentleman's budget today will keep us in Social Security for the remainder of the 10 years the gentleman is talking about.

I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) did. The budget he brought out of committee was an honest budget. It told this conference and this Congress and the American people that if they want tax cuts, they have to pay for them. They have got to do the spending cuts that they suggested.

However, the gentleman's own conference said, no. As I told the gentleman privately, and I will say publicly, if the gentleman would reconcile the cuts in a public manner on this floor first and then go to the tax cuts, he would have some support on this side. But I am skeptical, when they bring a budget that even their own conference will not support to the floor on the spending cuts, but yet we are going to have a tax cut on the floor in a very short period of time, that this is what we are going to get.

Our budget balances without using Social Security by 2013. As the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) said a moment ago, it is immoral what this Congress, these last few Congresses, are doing to our children and grandchildren.

When we talk about spending cuts, I have heard it explained that in the agricultural function it is just 1 percent. But let me remind all of us, we took 2 years writing the farm bill that passed with two-thirds support, equally divided Democrats and Republicans, and the President signed it. We stayed within the budget that they asked us to last year.

Anyone that suggests we can make the cuts that the gentleman is suggesting, assuming that it passes, without reopening the farm bill and rewriting it, is totally misinformed as to what the facts are regarding the authorizing of various programs.

I find it very interesting that today in the Committee on the Judiciary we were supposed to have passing out a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. As many know, I am for it. I am a cosponsor of it. One of the happiest days in my life was when we passed it on this floor; one of the saddest days was when it went down by one vote in the Senate.

Had that passed in the Senate, they could not bring their budget to the floor today. The only budget we will vote on today is this budget right here, the blue one, the Blue Dog line, that shows that we will balance without using Social Security in 2013. They could not do it had we had a constitutional restraint. Yet some on the gentleman's side have the audacity to suggest that the budget is a good one; but yet we want to have a constitutional amendment to require us to do what we are not willing to do when we have a chance of doing it.

In 1999 the Republican leadership issued a statement pledging to protect the Social Security surplus: ''As leaders of the House of Representatives, we will not schedule any legislation that spends one penny of the Social Security trust fund. This leadership is committed to ending the 30-year raid on seniors and paying down the debt.''

We could not help 9–11–01, and we cannot help the fact that our economy has gone south, but we can stop digging the hole deeper as of today. That is what the Blue Dog budget does. It is the only budget that stops digging the hole deeper.

Now, one area we cut below the President, and our spending levels, I repeat, in this budget we do not spend one penny more than President Bush asked us to spend, one penny; but there is one area we want to cut below the President. We want to cut $420 billion out of the President's budget and somewhat less out of the chairman's budget for interest on the national debt. They can bring out all of the blue books, they have been there when the gentleman's party has been in charge, and some of us on this side would like to work with them. But they constantly and consistently deny us that opportunity, which, if they pass their budget today, once again, they deny us the opportunity.

We had a better budget 2 years ago. The economic situation of this country would not be as bad. I ask Members to support the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman, Mr. Chairman. I have enormous respect for the gentleman from Texas and for my friends for writing a budget, because writing a budget in Washington, D.C. for the Federal Government is not maybe the most challenging job in Washington, but it does have its moments of challenges.

Probably one of the biggest challenges in writing a budget, as my friends know, is when we have to explain to politicians who get elected by saying yes that sometimes we have to say no, or sometimes we have to do things that are difficult.

There is no question that when I wrote the original draft of this budget, I asked my colleagues to do something that was difficult. It maybe was more difficult than I had either the right to ask or the ability to ask; but I asked it, not because I thought it was easy, but because I thought it was important for us to at least begin the debate.

Particularly in Medicare, that is a debate that I recognize probably as being difficult maybe more than most Members because I have spent the last 12 years being stung by attacks from opponents back home who, in years where we did nothing to Medicare, were able to come up with phantom votes here and there suggesting that somehow, again, as a Republican, I think maybe just because I registered to vote as a Republican, that somehow I was cutting Medicare. It must be something that is just automatic when you become a Republican, it seems, these days.

But it could not be further from the truth. When it comes to our budgets in Medicare and so many of these programs, as my friends know, particularly since 1998, we have just been spending money around here like it is going out of style in every category. We almost cannot name a category that has gone down by any significant portion over the last 5 years, in particular, since we got the balance.

So it was not so much that I was saying cut, but I was saying slow down. That is all I was trying to say was slow down. That is what I was trying to say in Medicare was slow down. We had put $400 billion in. I asked them to look for that waste within Medicare. We know it is there. I have three great examples that came out of those blue books we were talking about.

The Medicare program pays as much as eight times, just think about this, I would say to my friends, eight times the cost of any other Federal agency when we pay for the same drugs and medical supplies. I do not know, maybe double would be a reasonable level; but eight times does not make much sense to me.

Medicare provides overpayments of $12.1 billion in 1 year. All right? That is just another example.

In 2002, it was estimated that improper, and that is in addition to overpayments, we are talking about just plain improper, fraudulent payments under Medicare were estimated at $13 billion. Let me quickly do the math: 13, 12, that is 25. We do not even know what the cost of the drugs are, but that is $25 billion in 1 year, as an example.

I do not know about the other Members, but that pays for a lot of prescription drugs for seniors. Just in the first year of the drug benefit that almost all of us support, we are only talking about $7 billion as a drug benefit. That is just the first year of the phase-in. That is three times, almost four times, the amount of the initial drug benefit we waste in the Medicare program. That is before we even talk about reimbursements.

My friend, the gentleman from Texas, and I have been laboring on the Rural Health Care Coalition since I think the day the gentleman walked in this place, and certainly the day I walked in. Medicare is not serving our seniors because of a crazy reimbursement system that has been out there. But we come down here to the well and we say, oh, gosh, do not touch that, it is Medicare.

Heaven forbid we would try and do something around here in any of these programs in order to try to control them, because around here in Washington our level of compassion and concern has been equal to the amount of money we are willing to put into the program.

So instead of saying to Medicare, the Defense Department, agriculture, I do not care what it is, instead of saying, where did that $13 billion go; we are not going to give it to you again next year until you find it, instead, what we say is, oh, quick, quick, let us pass a budget that puts in $400 billion more.

Let us hurry up and do that because heaven forbid we would look at a senior citizen straight in the eye and say, Do you know what? The program is not working as well as it should. It is not doing the job we promised; it is wasting money.

So that is what I was asking for. The gentleman is right, I did not get the votes for that. We will live to have that discussion another day because my guess is that in order for the actual bill to come to the floor, we are going to have to make some of those adjustments.

I could go on. That is the most politically sensitive one in the bunch. I could go on and on through less politically sensitive issues. But what I am asking us to do, and it is article 1 of the Constitution that I believe gives us that responsibility. The gentleman showed a chart that defines it by President. I could show a chart, and I know we are talking about the partisan jabs, I could show a chart that showed the exact same figures but showed them under Republican and Democratic Congresses.

□ 1815

It does not matter, as I said to my friend from Mississippi, it does not matter what happened in the past. It matters what we look to do in the future. My colleagues have got a plan. We disagree with it because it does not, we do not believe, do the one thing that we believe can help us here the most, and that is stimulate the growth in the economy that brings in so much of the revenue that we need.

The second thing it really does not do, and we disagree with the President on this, mostly not because we disagree with the President, but because it is our job to control spending. If we do not do it by the time the bill gets to his desk, it is not going to get done, and so that is why we asked for the waste, fraud and abuse within these reconciliation instructions.

Last but not least, and I think my friend wants us to yield, the balanced budget amendment, and I am a cosponsor and have been and voted for it. The one problem with a balanced budget amendment, of course, is it takes about 8 years to get it into place, and what we said in 1995 and what we are both saying here today in a bipartisan way, regardless of our plan, let us just do it. Forget about the amendment for a second. Let us do it. Let us actually go in and balance it as opposed to just saying that we ought to have a constitutional amendment to do it.

The one thing the balanced budget amendment does provide is an exception. Two things actually. One is national emergency, and certainly I think September 11, obviously we in a bipartisan way agree that that is a national emergency; and the second is war, and clearly, we are in a war. So while I support that, I think we ought to just do it.

We put ourselves on a path under both of our plans, but we believe ours is a better path, and that is the reason.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I would just say there are 35 Blue Dogs that stand ready to work with the gentleman's side on every one of the issues in the blue books that my colleague had up. If we would have the same spirit on those issues that we have had by allowing us to have this 1 hour this year, which we were not allowed to have last year, we would have made a lot of progress on this.

The fact that my colleagues were kind enough this year to allow the Blue Dogs to have 1 hour of debate so we can have this discussion, we do think it is a better plan, but it is up to the will of the majority of the House as to whether our plan is better than my colleagues. We will stand by the will of the majority.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his comments.

As I say, I respectfully oppose the gentleman's and the Blue Dogs' substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 254, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

AYES—174

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Ballance
Becerra
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono
Boswell
Boyd
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Case
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hill
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kilpatrick
Kind
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wu
Wynn

NOES—254

Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carson (OK)
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
English
Evans
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Matheson
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanders
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Buyer
Gephardt
Hyde
Reynolds
Thornberry
Udall (CO)

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) (during the vote). The Chair advises Members there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1838

Messrs. EVERETT, TURNER of Ohio, FRANKS of Arizona, FERGUSON, ENGLISH and GILCHREST changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. GUTIERREZ, EDWARDS, COSTELLO and Mrs. BONO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, on House rollcall vote 78, on the Hill Substitute to H. Con. Res. 95, I mistakenly cast my vote as a ''no''. I intended to vote ''aye'' and support the Hill substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 108–44.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. TOOMEY

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 2 in the Nature of a Substitute offered by Mr. TOOMEY:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2013.

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For the purpose of enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal Year 2003: $1,323,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,340,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,504,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,642,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,768,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,872,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,985,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,095,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,198,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,324,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,460,635,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $36,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $126,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $112,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $97,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $85,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $90,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $92,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $97,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $228,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $325,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $343,575,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,790,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,811,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,888,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,961,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,019,225,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,072,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,144,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,209,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,297,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,371,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,463,897,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,776,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,824,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,880,352,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,931,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,979,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,033,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,110,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,178,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,272,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,333,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,433,558,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $453,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $484,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $376,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $288,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $211,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $161,184,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $124,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $82,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $73,988,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $8,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $−27,077,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $6,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $7,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $7,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $8,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $8,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $9,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $9,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $9,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $10,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $10,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $11,010,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $3,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $4,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $4,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $4,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $4,579,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $4,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $4,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $4,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $4,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $4,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $4,364,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $392,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $386,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $400,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $420,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $440,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $460,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $438,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $480,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $462,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $494,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $480,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $507,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $497,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $522,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $516,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $536,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $551,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,541,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $24,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $28,626,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,128,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $31,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,608,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $32,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $33,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,389,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $33,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,398,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $34,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $36,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,737,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $23,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $22,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $23,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $24,344,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $25,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $27,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $28,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,393,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $2,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $2,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $2,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $2,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $2,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $2,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $2,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,182,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $3,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,295,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $30,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $29,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,866,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $30,250,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $30,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $30,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,199,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $31,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $33,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $34,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $37,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,590,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $24,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $23,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $26,144,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $25,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,113,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $24,035,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,523,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $24,239,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,066,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $22,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,388,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $8,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $7,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,633,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $8,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $9,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $8,628,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $8,763,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $8,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $8,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,840,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $64,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $65,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $65,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $66,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $67,693,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $68,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $69,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $71,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $72,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $74,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,228,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $76,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,924,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,923,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,990,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $14,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $14,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $15,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $15,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $16,075,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $16,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $16,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,288,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $86,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $84,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $84,376,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $86,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $88,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $90,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $92,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $93,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $95,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $97,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $99,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,583,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $221,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $218,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $235,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $235,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $248,561,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $265,324,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $284,054,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $283,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $303,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $323,793,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $322,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $345,221,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $343,935,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $370,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $368,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $394,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $393,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $423,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $421,858,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $248,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $261,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $275,475,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $312,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $309,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $332,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $332,299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $352,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $352,287,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $372,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $371,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $392,052,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $392,309,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $420,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $423,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $453,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $450,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $490,497,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $490,754,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $326,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $334,373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $315,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $321,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $326,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $329,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $332,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $334,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $337,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $339,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $345,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $347,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $354,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $355,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $362,278,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $363,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $376,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $377,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $379,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $380,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $393,564,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,420,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $16,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $17,975,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,975,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $24,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $31,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $34,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,481,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $57,597,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $60,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,692,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $65,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $63,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $62,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $65,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,502,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $66,888,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $68,158,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $72,646,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $69,805,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $74,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,132,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $38,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $37,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $37,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $37,581,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,026,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $37,963,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $38,880,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,633,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $39,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $40,884,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $42,152,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $43,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $44,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,464,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $18,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $19,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,213,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $19,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $19,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,760,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $20,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,572,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,323,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $239,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $256,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $256,367,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $301,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $301,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $336,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $336,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $355,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $355,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $368,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $368,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $379,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $379,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $387,382,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $387,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $394,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $401,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $401,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $403,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $403,084,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$25,986,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$26,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$58,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$61,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$103,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$106,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$134,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$137,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$172,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$174,839,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$184,626,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$187,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$197,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$200,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$213,132,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$216,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$227,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$230,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$244,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$248,504,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$42,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$42,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$52,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$51,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$51,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, −$53,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$53,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$52,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$56,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$56,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$59,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$59,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$61,229,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$61,229,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TAX SIMPLIFICATION AND FAIRNESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 11, 2003, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to—

(1) reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $35,420,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, $126,232,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, $512,195,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $1,599,943,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013; and

(2) increase the level of direct spending for that committee by $4,380,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003, $1,111,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $17,393,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $23,096,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the level of direct spending for that committee by $3,600,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 and outlays flowing therefrom.

(b) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 18, 2003, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,409,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $17,622,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $50,718,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $613,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $8,276,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $25,665,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(C) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $3,160,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $80,495,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $292,506,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(D) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $30,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004, $390,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $381,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(E) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The House Committee on Government Reform shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $2,518,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $33,042,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $104,405,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(F) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—The House Committee on House Administration shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $11,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $87,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $241,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(G) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.—The House Committee on International Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $367,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $4,124,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $12,183,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(H) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $201,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $2,317,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $6,548,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(I) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $91,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $1,095,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $3,008,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(J) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE.—The House Committee on Science shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $2,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $19,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $40,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(K) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—The House Committee on Small Business shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $0 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $0 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $0 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(L) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $438,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $5,563,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $16,104,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(M) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,056,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $13,449,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $39,848,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(N) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $8,514,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $73,579,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $292,553,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds for Legislation Assumed in Budget Aggregates

SEC. 301. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICAID.

In the House, if the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that—

(1) modernizes medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), and

(2) reduces new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom by $9,010,000,000 for fiscal years 2009 through 2013,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase allocations of new budget authority and outlays for that committee (and make other appropriate changes in budgetary aggregates) by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed $3,258,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2004 and $8,944,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008.

SEC. 302. RESERVE FUND FOR BIOSHIELD.

In the House, if the appropriate committee of jurisdiction reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes a program to accelerate the research, development, and purchase of biomedical threat countermeasures and—

(1) such measure provides new budget authority to carry out such program; or

(2) such measure authorizes discretionary new budget authority to carry out such program and the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution that provides new budget authority to carry out such program,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations for the committee providing such new budget authority, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, by the amount provided for that purpose, but, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (1), not to exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom and $3,418,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and outlays flowing therefrom or, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (2), not to exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the total such revision for fiscal year 2004 may not exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 303. RESERVE FUND FOR RETIREMENT SECURITY.

Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that enhances retirement security through structural programmatic reform and the creation of personal retirement accounts, provided that such accounts are funded from the taxes currently collected for the purpose of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Program, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may—

(1) increase the appropriate allocations and aggregates of new budget authority and outlays by the amount of new budget authority provided by such measure (and outlays flowing therefrom) for that purpose;

(2) reduce the revenue aggregates by the amount of the revenue loss resulting from that measure for that purpose; and

(3) make all other appropriate and conforming adjustments.

Subtitle B—Implementation of Reserve Funds

SEC. 311. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE HOUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance appropriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) EXCEPTION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2005 for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $23,178,000,000 in new budget authority.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2004 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2004.

SEC. 402. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

SEC. 403. ACTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 302(b)(1) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT.

(a) COMPLIANCE.—When complying with Section 302(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee on Appropriations of each House shall consult with the Committee on Appropriations of the other House to ensure that the allocation of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees are identical.

(b) REPORT.—The Committee on Appropriations of each House shall report to its House when it determines that the report made by the Committee pursuant to Section 301(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the report made by the Committee on Appropriations of the other House pursuant to the same provision contain identical allocations of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees.

(c) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report providing new discretionary budget authority for Fiscal Year 2004 allocated to the Committee on Appropriations unless and until the Committee on Appropriations of that House has made the report required under paragraph (b) of this Section.

SEC. 404. CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES RESULTING FROM REALISTIC SCORING OF MEASURES AFFECTING REVENUES.

(a) Whenever the House considers a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report, including measures filed in compliance with Section 4 of this Concurrent Resolution, that propose to change federal revenues the impact of such measure on federal revenues shall be calculated by the Joint Committee on Taxation in a manner that takes into account:

(1) the impact of the proposed revenue changes on:

i. Gross Domestic Product, including the growth rate for the Gross Domestic Product;

ii. Total Domestic Employment;

iii. Gross Private Domestic Investment;

iv. General Price Index;

v. Interest Rates; and

vi. Other economic variables

(2) the impact on Federal Revenue of the changes in economic variables analyzed under subpart (1) of this paragraph.

(b) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make any necessary changes to allocations and aggregates in order to conform this Concurrent Resolution with the determinations made by the Joint Committee on Taxation pursuant to paragraph (a) of this Section.

SEC. 405. PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 201(a) OF THIS CONCURRENT RESOLUTION.

When reporting to the House reconciliation measures in compliance with Section 201(a) of this Concurrent Resolution, the Ways and Means Committee shall not report legislation, which:

(1) proposes to provide a graduated or phased-in reduction over time in:

(a) Individual income tax rates,

(b) Corporate tax rates, or

(c) The rate of taxes collected on the proceeds from investments, including taxes collected on capital gains; or

(2) conditions any changes in tax law upon the achievement of some level of:

(a) Federal Revenue,

(b) Federal Surplus, or

(c) Level of Public Debt.

SEC. 406. PROHIBITION ON USING REVENUE INCREASES TO COMPLY WITH BUDGET ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) For the purpose of enforcing this Concurrent Resolution in the House, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall not take into account the provisions of any piece of legislation which propose to increase revenue or offsetting collections if the net effect of the bill is to increase the level of revenue or offsetting collections beyond the level assumed in this Concurrent Resolution.

(b) Paragraph (a) of this Section shall not apply to any provision of a piece of legislation that proposes a new or increased fee for the receipt of a defined benefit or service (including insurance coverage) by the person or entity paying the fee.

SEC. 407. CRITERIA FOR ADJUSTMENTS TO ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES FROM USE OF THE "EMERGENCY" DESIGNATION.

(A) GUIDANCE.—In making a designation of a provision of legislation as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets the definition of an ''emergency'' set out in paragraph (b) of this Section.

(b) The term ''emergency'' means a situation that—

(1) requires new budget authority and outlays (or new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom) for the preventions or mitigation of, or response to, loss of life or property, or a threat to national security; and

(2) is unanticipated, which means that the underlying situation is sudden, urgent, unforeseen, and temporary.

(c) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, or conference report that contains an emergency designation under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 unless the proposed emergency requirement meets the definition of an ''emergency'' set out in paragraph (b) of this Section.

(d) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (c) of this section.

(e) DISPOSITION OF POINTS OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.—As disposition of a point of order under paragraph (c) or paragraph (d) of this section, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the point of order. A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent of the point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

(f) EFFECT ON AMENDMENT IN ORDER AS ORIGINAL TEXT IN THE HOUSE.— The disposition of the question of consideration under this section with respect to a bill or joint resolution shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.

TITLE V—SENSES OF CONGRESS

SEC. 501. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS TO ACHIEVE BUDGET GOALS.

(a) Congress finds that—

(1) The Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004 should achieve the following key goals:

(A) ensure adequate funding is available for essential government programs, in particular

(B) defense and homeland security;

(C) Foster greater economic growth and increased domestic employment by eliminating those provisions in the tax code (these provisions include, but are not limited to, the double taxation of corporate dividends, the taxation of capital gains, the limitations on expensing, the phased-in rather than immediate reduction of personal income tax rates, and the alternative minimum tax) that discourage economic growth and job creation;

(D) Bring the Federal budget back into balance as soon as possible; (2) The Federal Government spends billions of dollars each year on programs and projects that are of marginal value to the country as a whole. (3) Funding for these lower priority programs should be viewed in light of the goals of this Concurrent Resolution and whether or not continued funding of these programs advances or hinders the achievement of these goals.

(4) This Concurrent Resolution assumes that funding for many lower priority programs will be reduced or eliminated in order to increase funding for defense and homeland security while at the same time controlling overall spending.

(b) It is the Senate of Congress that the following programs should be eliminated:

(1) Title X Family Planning;

(2) Corporation for Public Broadcasting;

(3) National Endowment for the Arts;

(4) Legal Services Corporation; and

(5) Advanced Technology Program.

SEC. 502. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE ABOLISHMENT OF OBSOLETE AGENCIES AND THE FEDERAL SUNSET ACT OF 2003.

(a) Congress finds that—

(1) The National Commission on the Public Service's recent report, ''Urgent Business For America: Revitalizing The Federal Government For The 21st Century,'' states that government missions are so widely dispersed among so many agencies that no coherent management is possible. The report also states that fragmentation leaves many gaps, inconsistencies, and inefficiencies in government oversight and results in an unacceptable level of public health protection.

(2) According to the Commission, there are: more than 35 food safety laws administered by 12 different federal agencies; 541 clean air, water, and waste programs in 29 federal agencies; 50 different programs to aid the homeless in eight different federal agencies; and 27 teen pregnancy programs operated in nine federal agencies; and 90 early childhood programs scattered among 11 federal agencies.

(3) According to the General Accounting Office, there are 163 programs with a job training or employment function, 64 welfare programs of a similar nature, and more than 500 urban aid programs.

(4) GAO also indicates 13 agencies coordinate 342 economic development programs, but there is very little or no coordination between them. This situation had created a bureaucracy so complex that many local communities stop applying for economic assistance. At the same time, the General Accounting Office reports that these programs often serve as nothing more than funnels for pork, have ''no significant effect'' on the economy, and cost as much as $307,000 to create each job.

(5) In 1976, Colorado became the first state to implement a sunset mechanism. Today, about half of the nation's states have some sort of sunset mechanism in effect to monitor their legislative branch agencies. On the Federal level, the United States Senate in 1978 overwhelmingly passed legislation to sunset most of the federal government agencies by a vote of 87–1.

(6) In Texas, ''sunsetting'' has eliminated 44 agencies and saved the taxpayers $720 million compared with expenditures of $16.94 million for the Sunset Commission. Based on these estimates, for every dollar spent on the Sunset process, the State has received about $42.50 in return.

(b) It is the Sense of Congress that

The House of Representatives should adopt H.R. 1227, The Abolishment of Obsolete Agencies and Federal Sunset Act of 2003.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time in opposition be divided evenly between the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and myself.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I am completely agreeable. That procedure has been our custom and practice in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to myself.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by commending the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) for the outstanding work the gentleman has done. The gentleman has worked very hard. Our committee has worked very hard, and the budget is a good budget. But I believe the alternative budget that I am going to describe right now and that the Republican Study Committee is putting forward is a better budget. I want to go over the highlights of the differences and engage in this discussion about the alternatives.

Let us look at the major differences. The big difference between the Republican Study Committee budget and the committee budget are three.

First, we provide more tax relief. We provide more tax relief than the committee budget does, we provide more tax relief than any of the alternative budgets do.

Number two, we actually cut some spending. Now the committee's budget cuts the rate of growth of spending. Our budget actually cuts nondefense, not homeland security discretionary spending.

The third thing is we run smaller deficits and we get back to a balanced budget faster than any other budget, including faster than the Blue Dog budget that we just heard a lot of discussion about. We do it in 4 years, faster than any other, and that is not accounting for the faster economic growth that would result from our budget package. Let me run through these three areas.

First on the tax front, we recognize in this budget that we are still overtaxed. The fact is that Federal taxes consume about 21 percent of national income, and total taxes from all government in our country is over a third of national income. This is well above the post-war average high. The fact is we are not undertaxed; we are still overtaxed. Many of our constituents are facing tax increases at the State and local levels. They need to have that off-set, and we can do that in our budget.

Our budget accommodates the President's entire growth package; and that is critical because we need to get this economy growing again, so we accommodate the elimination of the double taxation of dividends. This would end a great inequity in our tax system, a bias in our current code, a bias that, frankly, falls disproportionately on older Americans; and it would also stimulate economic growth.

□ 1845

If we follow the wisdom of the President's proposal and eliminate the double taxation on dividends, it has a number of positive effects for our economy. It would immediately result in higher equity prices, which is a good start. The current tax also increases the cost of capital. By lowering the cost of capital, we encourage capital formation. It also would reduce the current distortion of the allocation of capital. Abolishing the double taxation will over time release billions of dollars for more productive investment.

The bottom line is the President's proposal encourages saving and investment and capital formation, and that helps sustain economic growth. That is why we need to do it.

We also need to accelerate the phase-in of marginal tax rate reductions. When you lower marginal income tax rates, you increase the incentive to save and work and invest, and when you increase the incentives, you get more savings and work and investment. If we delay this any further, we just postpone the beneficial effects.

In our budget, we accommodate the President's entire tax relief package. Then we do something more. We do not specify exactly what that would have to be, but, Mr. Chairman, it would be large enough to accommodate a 50 percent reduction in capital gains rates, and that would also significantly encourage economic growth. That kind of capital formation is a precondition for strong economic growth.

On the spending side, as I said earlier, ours is the only budget that makes some real cuts in spending. On the discretionary side, we do not cut defense spending. We use the same number that the President has proposed and the same number that the committee has proposed. We recognize this obligation. We recognize that we are at war. We do not cut homeland security funding. On the mandatory spending side, we do not touch Social Security at all, we make no changes, and we do not actually cut anything in mandatory spending, although we do restrain the rate of growth. What we actually do cut is in nondefense, nonhomeland security discretionary spending.

Why is it important to get this spending under control? Because, Mr. Chairman, total government spending is the real measure of the burden that the government imposes on our economy. More than deficits, more than the debt, it is the total amount of money that the government sucks out of the private sector, whether it does it by borrowing or whether it does it by confiscating people's money, that is the measure of the misallocation of capital. We all know there are a lot of vital programs that have to be funded, but on the margin we know that this spending occurs through a political process where Members are spending money to try to get reelected. It is not the allocation of capital that individual consumers and businesses would allocate for stronger economic growth.

The other problem with too much spending is the enormous waste. We have heard a discussion about that earlier, but the government cannot even account for over $17 billion in spending in 2001. The Federal Government acknowledges $20 billion in overpayments. The list of ridiculous misspent money, missing money, overpayments is a very long and a very embarrassing list, frankly. We are never going to wring that waste out of government until we impose some spending discipline.

The fact is government Federal spending, discretionary spending, total spending has been growing at several times the rate of inflation, and now is the time to rein that in. If we cannot rein that in now, Mr. Chairman, when can we rein that in?

The net budgetary effects of our budget is greater tax relief, modest spending discipline, and as a result we run smaller deficits for shorter periods of time, and we get back to a balance faster than any other budget proposal.

I heard the Blue Dogs come down on this floor and talk about how much they want to balance this budget, how quickly they want to do that, why they want to do that. I am glad to hear that. I look forward to their voting for our budget because it gets to a balance faster than any others.

The other point I would make is that there can be no doubt that our combination of lower taxes and less spending would lead to stronger economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), chairman of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, let me start by commending the gentleman from Iowa. It is always a tough duty to try to carry a budget through the House.

I have a couple of questions. Can the chairman of the Committee on the Budget confirm that the reconciliation instructions clarify how the Committee on Government Reform will be credited with savings resulting from legislation that it submits to the Committee on the Budget?

Mr. NUSSLE. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Does this language ensure that the Committee on Government Reform will receive full credit for any savings it reports that are consistent with its reconciliation instructions?

Mr. NUSSLE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Can the gentleman confirm that the Committee on Government Reform may write legislation that also achieves significant savings in discretionary programs?

Mr. NUSSLE. That is correct.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. And can the chairman also confirm that it is possible to meet the savings targets within the budget resolution without making any changes to Federal retirement annuities paid to participants in the Civil Service Retirement System, FERS, the Federal Employees Retirement System, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program?

Mr. NUSSLE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I thank the chairman for that clarification.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, my constituents find it very difficult to understand why at these times that we have economic uncertainty, that we are at war, we have large deficits and we are considering a reckless new tax cut. This amendment is even worse than the underlying bill. I oppose the underlying budget, and I oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, budgets speak to choice. What is important? I am frustrated with this new proposition that every budget priority should take a back seat to tax cuts. What is more important, funding for homeland security or tax cuts? Fiscal responsibility or tax cuts? Protecting Social Security or tax cuts? Prescription drugs for our seniors or tax cuts? Adequate funding for veterans' health and disability benefits or tax cuts? Keeping children nutrition programs or tax cuts? Adequate funding for education or tax cuts?

At a time that we are facing large deficits, it seems to me that we could find a lot better use for $1.3 trillion for tax cuts that primarily benefit the wealthy.

This plan digs a deeper hole in our Federal budget. We should treat the Federal budget with no less consideration than we would treat our own family home budget. This budget digs a deep hole in our Federal budget. It cuts vital programs that help the people in our society we have pledged to assist, our veterans, our children, our parents. It puts more pressure on our States and cities who are already under the fiscal gun, and it shows exactly the wrong kind of budget priorities.

Our budget should speak to our priorities. We must do better. We should approve the budget resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) that is more fiscally responsible, provides for a modest tax cut targeted to stimulate immediate growth in our economy, and provides adequate resources for prescription drugs for our seniors, education for our children, and homeland defense for all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Toomey amendment and the underlying budget resolution and support the Spratt amendment.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK).

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to lend my strong support to the Republican Study Committee budget. As chairman of the RSC, I am very proud of this budget that we have produced, and I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) for all his hard work on this. It reins in the astronomical spending increases we have had over the past few years and brings us back to balance in just 4 years. No other budget achieves balance as quickly as this one does.

When I came to Washington as part of the revolutionary class of 1995, we were determined and extremely serious to balance the budget and get us back on track, which we did. We were successful in doing that for the first few years, but lately we have presided over some of the biggest increases in spending in U.S. history. In the last 7 years, nondefense discretionary spending has grown 66 percent. The fiscal year 2003 budget alone was a 9 percent increase in discretionary spending from the year before. I do not know of any family's budget in this country that has had the good fortune to increase 9 percent in 2003. So why should the Federal Government continue spending increases in this amount?

This RSC budget holds the government to responsible increases that will not grow faster than inflation or the family budget. Our budget proposal achieves a 1 percent savings by looking for waste, fraud and abuse and eliminating it from the Federal Government. That is only 1 penny out of every dollar. We hear folks continue to say it is impossible to find that amount of money, that amount of waste, in the government.

I would like Members to take a look at this chart. Thirty-five food safety laws administered by 12 different agencies; 541 clean air, water, waste programs; 50 programs for the homeless in 8 different Federal agencies; 163 different job training employment programs; 64 welfare programs; 500 urban aid. It goes on. You can see for yourself there is a lot there that could be simplified. Most estimates indicate there are tens of billions of dollars wasted every year. Last year alone, there were estimated to be $13.3 billion in improper payments under Medicare.

It is time Congress gets serious about reining in wasteful spending and getting our budget under control. That is what we were sent here to do. That is what the American people expect us to do. They want us to stop the business as usual and stop the excuses.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HASTERT was allowed to speak out of order.)

NOTICE OF IRAQ WAR BRIEFINGS

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, for the information of all Members, I want to report that there will be two classified Members-only briefings regarding Iraq tonight and tomorrow. First, tonight, at 7:40 p.m., Secretary Rumsfeld will brief all Members in the Armed Services Committee hearing room located in 2118 of the Rayburn Office Building.

In addition, tomorrow, Friday, at 10:45 a.m., officials from the Department of Defense, the Department of State and the Joint Chiefs of Staff will provide this briefing also. This briefing will take place at the 2118 Rayburn location as well.

I encourage all Members to attend both these important briefings, tonight and tomorrow, so that they have the latest information prior to returning to their districts.

Members will be alerted to any further details via the e-mail whip notice system.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his hard work on the budget.

As the gentleman knows, the manager's amendment on the budget resolution includes reconciliation instructions to the Committee on Agriculture for savings in mandatory programs. To clarify for my colleagues and farmers and ranchers who follow this process, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget about the reconciliation instructions.

Mr. NUSSLE. If the gentleman will yield, I would be happy to respond.

Mr. OSBORNE. It is my understanding that the Committee on the Budget will work with the Committee on Agriculture to identify specific proposals that eliminate waste, fraud and inefficiencies so that any reductions do not come from farm programs and the crop insurance program. Is that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget's understanding?

Mr. NUSSLE. That is my understanding. The budget is intended to protect farm programs and the crop insurance program. Our committee will work with the chairman and other members of the Committee on Agriculture such as yourself to ensure that we protect critical farm programs and the crop insurance program. This includes an adequate funding level for programs authorized under last year's farm bill.

Mr. OSBORNE. I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Budget for his responses to my inquiries. As I understand what the chairman is saying, the Committee on Agriculture should look to eliminating waste, fraud and abuse, and that he will work to see that there are no reductions in the current farm program and crop insurance program other than those attributable to waste, fraud and abuse.

Mr. NUSSLE. The gentleman is correct. I appreciate his help and support in this endeavor.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would simply say that these colloquies we are hearing on the House floor indicate how difficult it is going to be to achieve the kind of reconciliation cuts that have been directed to various committees. We see the committee people coming out here and saying, You are not going to cut this, are you? You are not going to cut that, are you? You are not going to cut government pensions, for goodness sakes. We will correct the procurement system and save $43 billion.

That is why I find it hard to take this budget at face value. I am sorry, but that is way I approach it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his leadership on this budget. I rise in opposition to the Toomey amendment. But before I do that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to first offer my prayers and support for all of our brave soldiers currently serving in Iraq and the surrounding regions.

□ 1900

Mr. Chairman, the Toomey amendment would provide less discretionary spending than the Republican budget resolution, which means that his amendment would keep this Nation in deficit spending far past 2007. With respect to the underlying bill, our Nation is fighting an expensive war, the costs of which are yet unknown. Thus it is unconscionable that this body would take up a budget resolution that would propose cuts in key domestic programs.

According to the National Urban League, this budget resolution clearly shows how policy can affect the gap in black and white wealth accumulation. First, the biggest tax expenditure in the Federal Government is the deduction of health insurance. African Americans do not get access to this credit, as one third of African Americans get health insurance through Medicare. Thus this budget resolution on the House floor proposes to cut $300 billion out of minority communities through Medicare cuts. Over the next 10 years, this budget resolution would cut also as much as $470 billion in programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, education, and veterans benefits. In fact, the Republican Party's budget resolution drastically cuts domestic programs by $244 billion below the amount needed to maintain the FY 2003 funding levels.

I believe we owe the American people that we must take care of their affordable health care needs, and I believe the Democratic substitute amendment and budget offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) does exactly that. My constituents want their benefits under Medicare and Medicaid protected. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) would increase the resources for homeland security and first responders.

I say vote for the Spratt amendment and vote ''no'' on the Republican budget.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond and correct what I think was a misstatement.

The fact is the cuts in spending in our Republican Study Committee budget did not result in larger deficits. They result in smaller deficits because we have got less spending, and that means less debt, and that means we get back into balance faster than any other budget that will be considered today; and I am looking forward to the enthusiastic support of the Blue Dogs, who feel very strongly about getting back into balance.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

And I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania on this for his work on this alternative budget, and I offer it my full support. It is said that we simply cannot cut anymore and that the Nussle budget that we have, a lot of people are saying it cuts too deeply. This is simply wrong. When we look across the board and we look at what we have done as Republicans, frankly, over the past 8 years, since 1996, the first year of the first Republican budget, we have increased spending for all cabinet agencies substantially, much more so than inflation. Inflation has been about 21 percent since 1996. The Agriculture Department has gone up 27.5 percent; Commerce, 40.2 percent; Energy, 34.4; HHS, 94.7; HUD, 52.6; Interior, 45 percent since 1996. The State Department has gone up 68 percent; Labor Department, 23.8; Defense Department, 43.7. And how about education? It is always said we do not spend enough on education. Try a 131.9 percent increase since 1996.

And we say we cannot cut anything. We say we cannot find waste, fraud, and abuse, 1 percent of it. Come on. Let us get serious. We just passed an omnibus bill a couple of weeks ago that had items like $3.1 million for the Inventors Hall of Fame that I did not even know we had, or how about $750,000 for the Baseball Hall of Fame? The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame got $350,000. What are we doing? $800,000 to the Grammy Foundation. That now is part of the baseline. We are adding to that and we keep adding and adding and adding and adding. Where does it end? We have got to get some fiscal sanity, and that is what the Toomey budget does. This brings our budget back into balance faster than any other budget plan outlined, in 4 years.

We know that there is a lot of waste, fraud, and abuse out there. More than $8 billion has gone out in erroneous earned income tax credit payments. There is mismanagement of over $3 billion in the Bureau of Indian Affairs trust funds, over $2 billion in erroneous food stamp payments. Two years ago there was over $1 billion in unissued medical bills for Veterans Health Administration. The list goes on and on and on. We can cut more. We can actually give tax cuts and cut spending and come into balance much faster than the budget outlined by the Democrats and the Republicans in the majority. I urge support of the Toomey amendment, the Toomey plan.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before yielding to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), let me quote from a letter that was written to Speaker HASTERT by the head of the Paralyzed Veterans of America. He said, ''We do not consider payments toward disabled veterans, pensions for the poorest disabled veterans, and GI benefits for soldiers returning from Afghanistan to be waste, fraud, and abuse.''

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to this amendment and to the underlying Republican budget resolution and in support of the Spratt substitute that will be up shortly. The Federal budget is a statement of our Nation's priorities. It is where we put our national resources to meet our Nation's most important needs. Unfortunately, this budget has fundamental flaws and has misplaced priorities that I think shortchange the American people. Instead of investing in a strong, more prosperous America for years to come, the Republican budget neglects our economy, explodes the national debt, undermines key investments in homeland security, education, health care, and continues to spend Social Security trust funds. All of these priorities are sacrificed for another large tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. I guess it means we take from the many to give to the few.

I am most disappointed in the Republicans cuts in education, however. Prior to my service in this body, I served as the superintendent of schools for my home State of North Carolina, and I sought this office because the Republican majority under Newt Gingrich targeted public education in America, and I said I was coming to this House to fight to stop it. We have made a great deal of progress on changing the dialogue on this critical issue, but unfortunately the rhetoric is a lot more pro-education than the record.

Last Congress the President of the United States signed into law the No Child Left Behind Act, which promised to start new investments to improve schools in this country; but before teachers, students and parents get a chance to figure out the tough requirements that we passed, and, yes, I voted for that legislation, under this new law the administration has failed to fund its own program; and the fact is that this budget underfunds it with the consent of the administration, totality so far by about $20 billion to No Child Left Behind. I cannot and I will not agree to these outrageous cuts in education.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget's $400 million cut eliminates afterschool initiatives in my home county for children, about 11,000 of them. It cuts teacher quality programs for every State in this country. For the State of North Carolina, $1.7 million. For the great universities and colleges we have in this country that are training our future leaders, it will cut Pell grants in these programs to make a difference; Cutting the Perkins loans money that makes a difference, having children who transfer from community college to university. This budget cuts $765 million for COPS, et cetera, et cetera.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, probably the worst example of misplaced priorities in this budget is the shameful treatment of our children of our fighting men and women. As we all know, right now Americans, men and women, are now putting up a proud fight on the other side of the world, and yet in this budget we are cutting Impact Aid to schools in this very budget that they have proposed. That is wrong. The Observer in my home county said a 14.5 percent cut will eliminate $173 million that helps pay for books and classrooms for these children, and that is absolutely wrong. We can do better.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes for the purposes of entering into a brief colloquy with the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year of 2004. First, I would like to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for his willingness to work in partnership with me to ensure that this budget resolution lays the groundwork for a successful reauthorization of highway and transit programs. I am pleased that this resolution includes a contingency procedure for surface transportation, which will provide the flexibility we need to reauthorize our highway and transit programs. Under this contingency procedure, spending from the Highway Trust Fund for highway and transit programs will be increased above baseline levels to the extent that Highway Trust Fund receipts are increased. For every dollar increase in Highway Trust Fund receipts, a dollar increase in budget authority for highway and transit programs will be permitted. This contingency procedure is a necessary first step in our efforts to meet the infrastructure investment needs of our Nation's highways, bridges, and transit systems.

I have three concerns with the resolution I hope can be worked out in conference. First, the baseline level assumed in the resolution for the trust fund share of transit programs is frozen at the fiscal year 2003-enacted level. The reason that has been given for this assumption is uncertainty over the solvency of the transit account of the Highway Trust Fund. I want to assure the chairman that my committee intends to restructure transit programs such that the solvency of the transit account will be ensured. This restructuring, which is also proposed in the President's budget, will allow the transit account of the Highway Trust Fund to support increased spending levels.

Second, I am concerned that the resolution allocates just $3.378 billion each year for the airport improvement program. This is below the President's request and significantly below what will be needed to meet our airport capital needs when we reauthorize aviation programs later this year.

Finally, I believe the reconciliation instructions for the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure are based on unrealistic assumptions. Most of the mandatory spending under my committee's jurisdiction results from Coast Guard and railroad industry retirement programs. I do not agree with the assumption in the resolution that these programs can be cut.

I hope to continue working cooperatively with the chairman on these concerns as the resolution goes to conference with the Senate. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Budget if he will continue to work with me to address these concerns.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I thank the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for his work in getting us to this point in time. Obviously there are a number of challenges. I will continue to work with him and members of his committee as we go to conference. We have a huge issue this year, as the gentleman knows. It is going to fall on his committee. We have challenges we need to meet in all of the transportation needs of our country. So, yes, I would be happy to work with the chairman as we move to conference on this issue, and I appreciate his support of our resolution.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, again I thank the chairman for his work and working with me and trying to work through these important issues. I do believe we need a budget, and he has a tremendous task in front of him. He has done all he could for my area of transportation, and I urge support for this resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining 9 minutes be yielded to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) as long as he does not give me another zinger here.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

□ 1915

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Toomey plan, which I find even worse, if possible, than the majority Republican plan. I have been doing this now for 7 years, and every year the sense of unreality grows greater as I see charts and graphs on the other side that bear, in my opinion, very little relation to reality. The charts and graphs this year, the budgets proposed, both of the Republican budgets, seem to me totally unrealistic. The charts are misleading in an astonishing number of respects.

We are dealing with what can only be called voodoo economics. But we have to ask ourselves, among all the numbers, what is really going on here? Well, if you set aside all the numbers, and you look at all the different changes that are being made, two things are going on.

The Republican majority is determined, absolutely determined, to shift the burden of government from the Federal level to the State and local level. This is an effort to cut taxes at the Federal level and increase them at the State and local level. It is an effort to reduce the amount of money that the Federal Government provides States and municipalities for environmental issues, for health care, for education, in order to diminish the size of the Federal Government. That is it. That is what is going on. That is number one.

Number two, the second effort that is being made by the majority here is to make sure that the burden of taxation in this country is reduced from those at the upper income levels, so that it burdens those at middle income levels more than it has in the past. The way of doing this, of course, is to give little, bitty tax cuts to people in the middle of the income scale, and to give massive tax cuts to people at the upper end of the income scale. The reason for doing this, I would add, is the other side believes in a flat tax, but they do not want to argue a flat tax; they simply want to arrive there.

Look at a couple of the charts. We have heard over and over again how much ordinary citizens will benefit from eliminating the tax on dividends. Look at the chart. Here is the tax benefit. This is designed to show how people at different income groups will benefit.

Let us skip all of those who earn less than $100,000, because even if they are just below $100,000, households will only get about $300 a year. If you earn between $100,000 and $200,000, you get $885. If you earn between $100,000 and $200,000 a year, you get a total of $885. But if you move up the scale to where you are earning around $1 million, that is where the benefit comes. Then you get an average tax benefit, annually, of $45,000. That is why everything the other side says about averages makes no sense.

Then they say we need to accelerate the tax cuts passed last year and make them permanent. The same deal. If you earn between, pick a different category, pick between $200,000 and $500,000 a year, you get $2,000 a year. Below that it is not much. But if your household takes in about $1 million a year, it is $63,000 a year.

There is no moral justification for stripping this much money out of the Federal Government, cutting education, cutting veterans' benefits, in order to give tax cuts to the richest people in the country. It is an outrage.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the previous speaker, just to observe that under the budget that we are proposing, the Republican Study Committee, and under the President's tax plan, a family of four making $35,000 a year would pay nothing in federal income taxes. Zero. In fact, the top 50 percent of wage earners in America pay 96 percent of all Federal income taxes. When you lower taxes, it is just hard not to lower the taxes on the people who are actually paying the taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman challenged that statement, because we are hearing a lot of rhetoric here that does not track.

I continually hear from my constituents that we need to rein in runaway Federal spending. Do you know what? They are right. More government spending does not necessarily make our economy better. When we are at war, and we are, this is the exact time when we should be reducing spending, cutting taxes and getting the economy back on track.

When a family sits down to manage their monthly budget, they have to prioritize what is best for them at that time in their lives, and they usually make a list of needs and wants. A need is not the same thing as a want. For a family, a need is a roof over their head or food on the table. A want could be dinner out at a restaurant or a movie. So you fund first things first. Then whatever is left over at the end lets you fund the wants. You cannot just spend, spend, spend and hope you have enough to cover the tab.

The same needs to be done with the Federal budget. During these difficult times, when we are at war, when we need to spur the economy, we must differentiate between the needs and wants. We cannot just spend, spend, spend.

Our first need is to protect our country, so that means we fully fund defense. While this budget does not devote a full 4 percent of gross domestic product to the national security as I would prefer, it does meet the President's request for homeland security funding.

I will tell you something: This Toomey budget funds defense higher than domestic spending for the first time in many years. I think, because of our situation, we need it. Our Constitution requires us to provide for a common defense. Let us not shirk that responsibility.

Another priority is to help the economy rebound. It is a proven fact that when people can keep more of their own money, the economy grows. That is why we lower taxes. When entrepreneurs have more money, they can use that capital to hire more employees, buy more equipment or expand their business.

This economy could use a turnaround, and letting people keep more of their own money will help our economy grow.

Frankly, I am a bit disappointed in the Republican Study Committee budget because it does not do more to rein in Federal spending. However, I think most would agree, this is a good compromise for this time.

Look, this budget makes tough choices; but that is why we are elected, to make tough choices. The good people of my district sent me here because they wanted a smarter, more efficient government, and the Republican Study Committee budget is a step in the right direction; increasing defense, lowering taxes and reining in runaway government spending. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, the budget that we have put forth by the Republican majority is almost an unbelievable exercise in fiscal irresponsibility. On the very first day of the war that we are now fighting, the majority party introduced a budget resolution that does not provide 1 cent, not 1 cent, to prosecute this war. This budget resolution contains more than $1 trillion in tax cuts that would benefit very few Americans, while endangering Social Security and Medicare.

I offered an amendment to the budget resolution to express the sense of the Congress that no new tax cuts should be passed until the Health, Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds are secured, but I was, of course, denied the opportunity to offer the amendment here tonight.

When we take a look at what is before us, when so many things are uncertain, I believe we need to pause before we pass into law huge, permanent tax cuts paid for by shortchanging essential programs, such as Medicare, education, veterans and funding for first responders. Right now we do not even know how long the war may last or what it might cost. It is irresponsible to pass a budget without taking all information into account.

If you take a look just the part on the veterans, the majority party cuts $14.2 billion over the next 10 years in benefits such as compensation for service-connected disabilities, burial benefits and GI education benefits. They are cut in this. What kind of message does that send to our troops fighting overseas? The fighting troops today are the veterans of tomorrow.

The Republican plan also fails to provide necessary homeland defense for State and local communities. It is just as important to provide homeland defense resources, training and staff for our local firefighters, EMTs, police officers and medical workers as it is to equip our troops overseas.

The Democratic substitute we will have a chance to vote on later tonight will provide $34 billion in extra money, new money, over the next 10 years for homeland security. In fact, $10 billion of this money would go to our States and local communities, right now this year.

I would urge a no vote on the budget resolution of the Republican Party as it is fiscally irresponsible. Vote no on the Toomey substitute, and support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from New Jersey, I yield myself such time as I may consume to observe that although our budget grows spending every year, total spending grows, it grows at a slower rate than the alternative budgets, and that is why we are able to get back to balance faster than any other budgets, and why I look forward to the Blue Dog support, and that is why the Americans for Tax Reform and Citizens Against Government Waste have endorsed the Republican Study Committee budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the proposed amendment offered by my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

As elected officials, we are sent here and are supposed to be responsible to the people that send us to office, but government spending has ballooned out of control, and it is the people back home in our districts who are the ones forced to foot the bill.

Over the last 7 years, discretionary spending has grown at an average rate of 3.5 times the rate of inflation. I do not know anyone back in my district who has seen their family budget go up at such rates time and time again. Spending is growing at a rate faster than the family budgets. It must stop.

Right now people back in our districts are turning on their TVs, they are seeing our men and women, our sons and daughters, our friends and neighbors in harm's way. We are engaged in a war on terrorism. We are still experiencing the aftermath of 9/11 as it affects our economy.

So we are asking our families to tighten their belts because of that. We are asking county governments, State governments to do more with less. Is it not the responsibility of us here in Washington to lead then by example, to do the same thing, maybe to even take one step further?

We can give a lot of examples, and you have heard some already, about the waste in government: Over $8 billion in erroneous earned income tax payments; I think someone else mentioned around $13.3 billion on Medicare; around $1 billion under the veterans' programs.

Let me say, cutting wasteful spending is not enough. We in Congress must take the next step and actually begin to make the tough decisions we were sent here for in the first place.

Every single program that we vote on has someone behind it that supports it and likes that program. But we are elected to Congress to make those tough choices, to do what is the first priority of us in Congress, to make sure that our folks back at home are safe, that this is a secure Nation, and that our men and women and troops overseas have the supplies, equipment and training necessary to get the job done.

We cannot do less than sending them a responsible budget. Our children, our neighbors and our troops, they are dependent on us.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the administration's budget cuts highway construction by $2.5 billion below this year's budget and slashes funding necessary to keep Amtrak running. The official House Republican budget cuts the discretionary transportation programs by 22 percent below the 2003 budget enacted just a month ago. The proposal before us is even worse.

The administration claims to be committed to economic growth and jobs, but this administration has the worst job growth record since Herbert Hoover. In fact, the administration's record is job loss, not growth; nearly 2 million non-farm payroll jobs lost in 2 years. On average, that is 73,000 jobs lost for every one of the 26 months of this administration. Yet cuts in transportation spending loses even more jobs tacked onto that miserable Republican economic record.

The Republican Party is only concerned about tax cuts for the already wealthy. When the economy is doing well, cut taxes for the already wealthy. When the economy is in recession, cut taxes for the already wealthy. When we are at peace, cut taxes for the already wealthy. Now while we are at war, cut taxes for the already wealthy.

Their highest priority is tax cuts for the already wealthy. They are not paying for their war, not reducing their deficits and debt, not keeping their promises to leave no child behind, not providing health care for veterans and the elderly.

Mr. Chairman, the already wealthy do not need more tax cuts. Vote no on this Republican budget and support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to support the balanced budget alternative offered by my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

□ 1930

The Toomey budget offers several key priorities for the Nation at this time of war and economic uncertainty.

The people of Colorado sent me here to rein in out-of-control government spending, to cut taxes, and to get government off their backs. Instead of spending the people's money like there is no tomorrow, we ought to provide real leadership and real solutions to demonstrate responsible fiscal discipline.

Mr. Chairman, just as it is our duty to protect American families from cowardly acts of terrorism, it is also our duty to protect the well-being of American families by balancing the budget to grow the American economy. It is our duty to protect the people's wallets by allowing taxpayers to keep more of their hard-earned dollars. I do not want to mortgage the future of working families because we cannot say no to a government that is far too big and spends far too much. The American people will be proud of the Toomey budget because it keeps President Bush's tax cuts intact, while balancing the budget in a realistic 4-year time frame.

I ask my fellow Members of Congress to stand up and to do the right thing for America. Let us not shirk our responsibilities to future generations. Please join me in supporting the Toomey budget amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, both Republican budget resolutions, the leadership resolution and the Toomey alternative, give us high deficits, high interest rates, and increased trade deficits. They take capital out of the capital markets and make it unavailable for private business investment, thus resulting in slower economic growth.

Now, to sell anything that bad, one needs a commercial. This morning I brought such a commercial to the floor, but marketing experts tell us a commercial requires repetition. So here, once again, is a commercial on behalf of both Republican budget resolutions:

Allowing corporations to skip out on their American taxes just by renting a hotel room in the Bahamas: $4 billion. Ending taxes on dividends: $385 billion. Ending the estate tax, even for the largest estates: $662 billion. Knowing you can pass the entire cost to future generations: Priceless.

RepubliCard: It is everything the super-wealthy want it to be.

Also available, the Deficit Express Card, now with a $4.2 trillion credit limit. The Deficit Express Card: Don't leave the House without it.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the creative and very amusing account from my good friend who just spoke about this. However, I would remind him that if he is very concerned about the size of the deficit and the magnitude of the debt, then he will vote for the RSC budget, the Toomey budget, because that is the one that gets us back to balance quickest; that is the one with the smallest deficits and the least debt.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we are at war, and I think most taxpayers understand you spend what it takes to win a war. We are in a recession as well, and taxpayers understand you spend what it takes to keep people in their jobs and to create new jobs for those who have lost them. But what taxpayers do not understand and will not accept is when we use it either to go on a spending spree that keeps us from balancing the budget, or keeps us from paying down our debt, or keeps us sending pork home to America and taking it out of their tax dollars.

This budget supports a strong national defense, promotes new jobs in a stronger economy, but it holds the line on spending. It says, let us tighten our belts in Washington; let us start to balance the budgets sooner than other budgets, and let us get people back to work.

This budget also includes a Federal sunset act, an encouragement for Congress to pass a bill to balance obsolete agencies, to eliminate duplication among our agencies, and to begin asking agencies to put up or shut up; to produce, to succeed, to support our taxpayers. What we are trying to do is conserve our dollars, identify wasteful spending within our agencies and within our programs so that we have enough dollars for a secure America, for health care, for education, and to send dollars back home.

Mr. Chairman, I support this budget. It makes a lot of sense, and perhaps because it makes sense is why it is getting so much resistance here in Washington.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield myself the remaining time.

I would just say in conclusion that if the Members of this House want to vote for a budget that gets us back in balance without balancing the budget on the backs of our children, our elderly, or our most worthy citizens, and our sick and disabled veterans; if they want to get back into balance by the year 2010, we present a budget, our own alternative, which takes us there steadily every year with a lower and lower deficit and accumulates $931 billion less in new public debt than the Republican budget.

So I would say that those who are conservative, those who want to vote for a fiscally responsible and conservative fiscal policy will have that opportunity, and I encourage my colleagues to vote for the House democratic alternative as something that achieves my colleagues' objectives.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the gentleman from North Carolina by observing that the Democrat substitute has more spending, has higher taxes, and it has larger deficits for longer than the substitute that we are debating at this point.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, he is incorrect on all accounts, including the assignment to me to North Carolina. I am from South Carolina.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the gentleman from South Carolina. That was the one mistake I just made.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the alternative budget resolution proposed by the Republican Study Committee.

I think sometimes we get into the details of these budgets and take a look at it just on a year-to-year basis, but I think it might be helpful for us to step back just a little bit, to step back to a time when I was only 2 years old. What was the tax burden on the average family in the year 1950? In 1950, you have a mom and a dad and 2 kids, and dad would go out and earn a dollar bill. Out of that dollar bill, 3 pennies of it would go for direct State, Federal, and local taxes.

Now, about 4 years ago, what happened? Mom and dad and 2 kids. Dad goes out to earn a dollar. Now we go from 3 cents to 38 cents tax on that average American family. That average American family is paying more in taxes than they are for what they pay for food and clothing and shelter combined.

In one generation we have come a long way in the growth of big government, and at a time when State and local governments and families all across the country are tightening their belts, it is time for the Federal Government to do the same thing.

The Republican Study Committee budget freezes total discretionary spending for 1 year. That is not too unreasonable considering it grew 9 percent this last year.

One of the reasons, Mr. Chairman, my constituents sent me here was to take a look at the idea of reducing not only the size, but the scope of Federal Government, and that is the debate we should be having. It is important to get rid of wasteful spending, but it is even more important that we take a look at actually reducing the scope of some of the things that we are trying to do.

When we are talking more tax on a family than 38 percent, more than they pay for food, clothing, and shelter, we are not talking about a safety net anymore, we are talking about excessive government.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of the Toomey amendment to the budget resolution. I congratulate our chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), on presenting a wonderful budget to this Congress. But indeed, there is even a better budget, and that is one that presents less government and more freedom.

Now, many people criticize this budget. They said there is not enough government spending involved in this budget. But, Mr. Chairman, over the last 5 years, we have increased VA, HUD and Independent Agencies 35.7 percent; Commerce and Justice 32.3 percent; Transportation, 79.7 percent; Education, 132 percent, and the list goes on.

How much government is enough? Does anything good happen in America that does not result from a government program? And if not, perhaps we should just double these budgets every year, or perhaps even triple them.

But let me tell my colleagues, since I have been on the face of the planet, the Federal budget has grown seven times faster than the family budget. If the family budget grew as fast as the government budget, right now that family budget would be at $79,059, instead of $51,407.

Mr. Chairman, if all of these government programs did us so much good, then perhaps we ought to look at increasing the funding for each and every one. But instead we know that HUD has spent $2.6 billion in Section 8 overpayments out of $31 billion. The National Park Service spends $800,000 for an outhouse, and it does not even work. And the list goes on and on and on.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, particularly at a time of war, and when families, hard-working American families, are having to make tough economic decisions around their kitchen table, should they not at least expect their Congress to make smart decisions? I do not think anything less should be expected out of this body. We can indeed save money without cutting needed programs and without raising taxes on the American people.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of the Nussle budget, but in stronger support of the RSC Toomey budget. Let me make it clear why.

This Congress, year in and year out, faces the challenge of setting a budget for our Nation, but it seems to me this year we are divorced from reality. The reality of this Nation is that in the last 7 years, nondefense discretionary spending has grown by a staggering 66 percent. Over the past 7 years, discretionary spending has grown at three and a half times the rate of inflation. In fiscal year 2003 alone, we increase spending by 9 percent over the previous year in 1 year only.

Enough is enough. The reality is that across America, local governments, State governments, city governments, county governments are making real dollar cuts in their spending.

Now, to its credit, the Nussle budget says, we ought to scale back. It walls off certain areas, but it says we ought to at least have a 1 percent cut in some areas where we can achieve that. But the rest of the budget spends too much money.

Let us look at what we have been doing in spending. Since 1996, agricultural spending is up 27.5 percent; Commerce Department, 40.2; Energy, 34.4; HHS, a staggering 94 percent; and Education, 131.9 percent. I could go on and on.

Mr. Chairman, I was here in 1995 when we enacted real spending restraint in this Congress. We did not actually stop the growth of spending, but we sure slowed it down. What is lacking now is discipline.

I was a participant in those hearings when we went across America and we asked the American people, can you do with less government? And they looked us in the eye and they said, yes. They said, so long as the restraint in spending, the cuts which we are asking them to make, were evenly distributed across our society so that all programs took some hits, they were willing to do it.

We face a slowed economy, and we face a war. It is time for the Congress to exercise discipline. It is time for the Congress to lead. The Toomey budget does that. It says that these are not normal times. It says that we can, in fact, do with a little less.

I want to draw a parallel to American businesses. Every one of us here knows businesses back home, every one of us knows the key to business. What is the key to business in America? It is year after year doing more with less. What has made America's economy boom in the last few years leading up to the recent situation? I will tell my colleagues what made it boom. It was improvements in efficiency. It is doing more with less.

□ 1945

Yet that is a concept that we do not even think about in government. Is it impossible for us to do more with less in the government? I suggest it is not, and I strongly support the budget of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would just make the following observation, Mr. Chairman. Most of us on both sides of the aisle talk a pretty good game about fiscal discipline. Here is the opportunity to walk the walk.

This substitute budget slows down the growth rate of government spending. It has more in tax cuts to get this economy growing again. It reaches a balance faster than any other budget that is considered today on the floor. It does so within 4 years. It is endorsed by Americans for Tax Reform and Citizens Against Government Waste.

For any of our colleagues who are serious about getting our deficit under control, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this substitute.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Republican Study Committee Budget Substitute. Former President Reagan said it best when he said, "government does nothing as well or as economically as the private sector." These are trying times and our Nation faces serious challenges in the coming months. With that in mind, it is irresponsible to fund projects that deter or deviate from the original intent of government. Instead, we must plan ahead and put forth our best effort to return to a balanced budget.

The RSC Budget includes all of President Bush's economic growth package, tax fairness proposals and balances the budget in 4 years. Four years. With the decreases in capital gains taxes, we will create over 1 million new jobs. There is no better time to return hard-earned money back to the American people. And I have no doubt that any effort to remain fiscally responsible will help boost economic growth.

In 1950, we were paying 2 percent of our money to the government. Today, that figure has skyrocketed to 30 percent. A 28 percent increase. In 2001, the Federal Government made $20 billion in overpayments. Not to mention that it cannot account for another $17.3 billion. Should not the American people be permitted to spend their money as they choose? How can we expect the people of this country to tighten their belt, when we cannot impose strict fiscal discipline on ourselves?

The RSC Budget includes a reserve fund for Social Security reform. Under the current system, nearly $6 trillion would be needed just to repay the trust fund. According to the Social Security Administration, it will take only about $7 trillion to fix the system permanently. Our baby boomers deserve a secure retirement. They paid for it.

This budget retains the President's defense spending numbers and the President's funding levels for homeland security—crucial now, when our courageous military heroes are depending on our support.

It is time to return to an era of economic prosperity. Time to put an end to reckless Federal spending. Men and women in our military are sacrificing their lives for our country. We have the power to do the same in Congress by making our own sacrifices to cut back on wasteful spending and balance the budget. There is no more appropriate time to do so than now. Having said that, I commend Mr. Toomey for introducing the best budget that he possibly could at this historic time in our Nation's history.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, and in support of the CBC and Democratic Alternative budgets.

I didn't think a budget resolution could be much worse than the one produced by the Majority, but then I see the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. This amendment calls for more tax cuts and more cuts in nondefense and non-homeland security spending.

Like the parent resolution offered by the Majority leadership, the budget cuts called for in the gentleman's alternative are just unrealistic. In fact, the $1.6 trillion tax cut proposed by the gentleman's alternative, requires that domestic spending be cut by an additional $8 billion.

The budgets proposed by Republican Study Conference and the Majority leadership will force authorizing committees' to reduce eligibility requirements and benefits for people programs that service our children, veterans, farmers, federal workers and more.

Like the parent resolution, the RSC amendment provides more tax cuts for the wealthy that are bound to continue to take our economy down the glide path of additional deficits. What I don't understand is why our distinguished majority rightly calls on all Americans to support the war effort in Iraq, but is not willing to pay for its costs. That is a major disconnect.

The Democratic and CBC alternative budgets offer targeted tax cuts that are designed to stimulate the economy and produce real jobs. Up to a million jobs will be produced by the Democratic Alternative in 2003. The Majority's plan, on the other hand, creates only 190,000 jobs in 2003.

The CBC and Democratic Alternative budgets provide more money for Medicare prescription drugs. The Democratic Alternative sets aside $528 billion in new money for a prescription drug program. We deliver and the President's party doesn't.

The Democratic Alternative and Black Caucus budgets invest in education and training. These increases will enable Congress to increase funding for the ''No Child Left Behind Act.''

The Democratic and CBC Alternatives protect our men and women in war; they advance the security needs of our homeland; they increase our investment in human capital and the nation's infrastructure. And they do so in a fiscally responsible way.

Soon we will be asked to redevelop and rebuild Iraq. We will be asked to pass appropriations that will develop and modernize that country's health care delivery system, repair and build 3,000 miles of major thoroughfares; upgrade the country's maritime ports, build classrooms and provide student supplies; provide 20,000 units of housing; rebuild the country's financial system; establish a potable water delivery system; and more.

It is ironic that this administration and the majority party in this Chamber will be asking us to spend billions to invest in redeveloping the infrastructure in Iraq while it simultaneously cuts back our investment in American cities, states and individual human capital. The Members on the other side of the aisle may be able to explain that to their constituents, but I know I won't be able to explain it to mine.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the gentleman's amendment and support the CBC and Democratic Alternatives budget resolutions.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 80, noes 342, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

AYES—80

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Brady (TX)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Cole
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Culberson
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Feeney
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Goode
Goodlatte
Green (WI)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Linder
Manzullo
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Pitts
Pombo
Radanovich
Rehberg
Rohrabacher
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherwood
Shimkus
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Weller
Wilson (SC)

NOES—342

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Bass
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burns
Burr
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Castle
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Janklow
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Buyer
Combest
Gephardt
Hyde
John
Kennedy (RI)
King (NY)
Lipinski
Smith (MI)
Thornberry
Udall (CO)
Vitter

☐ 2015

Messrs. GUTKNECHT, CONYERS, BRADLEY of New Hampshire, BONNER, SABO and Mrs. NORTHUP changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. MANZULLO changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 79 I was receiving a briefing on the war in Iraq with Secretary Rumsfeld and General Meyers. That occurred simultaneously with this rollcall.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Stated against:

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Chairman, during Rollcall Vote 79, I was detained at a briefing from Secretary Rumsfeld on the war with Iraq. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 108–44.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. CUMMINGS

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 3 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. CUMMINGS:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 through 2013 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $1,510,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,684,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,831,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,958,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,075,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,197,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,327,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,511,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,707,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,863,500,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $44,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $67,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $91,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $105,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $112,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $119,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $134,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $84,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $57,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $59,300,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $1,836,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,958,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,064,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,165,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,264,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,370,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,483,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,546,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,588,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,699,400,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $1,883,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,002,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,100,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,198,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,298,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,404,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,517,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,589,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,620,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,735,800,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: −$372,800,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: −$317,500,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: −$269,100,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −$239,800,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −$223,700,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,197,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,327,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,511,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,707,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,863,500,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $4,013,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $4,013,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2004 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $387,995,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $392,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $396,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $395,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $406,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $396,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $416,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $399,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $427,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,028,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $441,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $429,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $453,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $444,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $464,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $460,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $476,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $465,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $488,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $482,639,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $34,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,946,950,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $35,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,605,889,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $36,081,480,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,277,406,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $36,803,109,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,962,954,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $37,539,171,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,662,213,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $38,289,854,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,524,057,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $39,055,651,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,274,538,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $39,836,764,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,040,029,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $40,606,499,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,794,370,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $41,418,638,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,590,256,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $23,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $24,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,189,500,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $24,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,721,500,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $26,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $27,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,058,500,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $28,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,460,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,987,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $3,118,500,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,962,575,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $3,273,600,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,109,920,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $3,181,200,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,022,140,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $2,984,300,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,835,085,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,583,800,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,404,610,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,300,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,420,285,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,722,400,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,536,280,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,836,800,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,644,960,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,963,300,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,765,135,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $4,096,400,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,891,580,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $31,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $32,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $33,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $34,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $35,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $36,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $37,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $38,668,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $39,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $41,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,202,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,204,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $21,028,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,608,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $21,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $21,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $22,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $22,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $23,214,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $23,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,634,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $7,678,650,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,514,500,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $7,821,300,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,664,900,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $7,977,700,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,818,100,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $8,137,300,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,974,600,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $8,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $8,466,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,296,700,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $8,635,300,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,462,600,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $8,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,631,800,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $8,984,200,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,804,500,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,163,900,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,480,600,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $99,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $66,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $67,815,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,393,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $69,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $71,057,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $72,746,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $74,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $76,340,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $78,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $80,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,431,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,017,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $15,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $15,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $15,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $16,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $16,579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $16,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $17,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,904,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,242,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $107,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $117,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $129,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $126,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $142,417,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $156,658,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,325,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $172,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $189,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $185,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $208,389,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $204,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $229,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $224,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $252,149,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,107,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $242,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $238,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $247,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $242,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $252,770,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,825,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $257,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $262,981,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $268,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $262,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $273,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $279,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $273,495,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $284,657,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,964,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $290,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,543,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $250,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $265,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,608,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $292,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $292,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $313,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $313,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $336,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $336,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $351,278,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $351,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $377,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $377,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $403,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $403,968,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $403,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $403,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $460,889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $460,889,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $367,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $359,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $374,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $366,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $381,879,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $374,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $389,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $381,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $397,307,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $389,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $405,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $397,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $413,358,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $405,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $421,625,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $413,192,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $430,058,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $421,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $438,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $429,886,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $501,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $498,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $521,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $518,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $546,735,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $575,008,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $571,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $606,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $602,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $641,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $636,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $679,322,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $674,852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $720,505,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $715,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $766,154,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $760,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $816,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $810,363,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $64,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $66,863,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,526,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $68,869,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,492,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $70,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,516,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $73,063,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $75,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $77,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $79,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $82,234,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $84,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,007,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $40,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,971,260,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $40,957,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,137,860,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $41,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,387,760,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $41,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,720,960,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $41,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,137,460,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $46,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,500,420,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $47,871,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,913,500,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $49,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,379,660,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $50,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,876,120,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $52,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,427,460,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $19,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,213,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $19,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $19,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $20,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,572,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,323,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $255,938,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $307,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $307,866,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $345,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $345,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $372,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $372,992,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $400,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $425,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $425,477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $452,793,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $452,793,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $478,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $478,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $504,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $504,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $529,542,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $529,542,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than June 1, 2003, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive changes.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,043,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and $6,118,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(2) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the total level of revenues by not more than: $16,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, $1,677,500,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $6,712,500,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from

New York (Mr. OWENS) who was the architect of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus resolution.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to first congratulate the leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus for the agreement to produce this joint budget.

Our troops are in the field now, and we are going to support those troops. The best way we can support our troops is to try to bring them home by policy changes, not in body bags, but bring them home smiling on their feet. We also would like to support their families. This is a budget which we call ''Leave No Families Behind.''

Mr. Chairman, 35 percent of the members of the Army are African American. Two-thirds of the fighting force in Iraq, on the borders of Iraq, are members of working families. We want to take care of the families of the people who fight for America, and that is the gist of this budget. It is a budget for working families.

We have stayed within the requirements of the majority. Our current budget is $1.836 trillion. We have begun by adopting the Rangel shared sacrifice freeze on tax cuts, and this generated a revenue base of $1.5 trillion. This has allowed the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus to offer our current budget of $1.8 trillion. Our budget projections reached a low deficit of $72.9 billion in the year 2011, and we offer a surplus of $87.7 billion in the years 2012 and $127.7 billion in 2013.

It is the strong and overriding belief of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus that the budget and appropriations processes are the highest importance to our constituencies who make up the great majority of Americans. Budget priorities speak in a language of numbers and dollars that tell the people we represent how important their concerns and their welfare are to us. This budget was prepared against the backdrop of a recession at a time when the gap between the rich and the poor is greater in the United States than in any other Nation.

A recent report of the Federal Reserve states that the median net worth of white families went up 17 percent to $120,900, while the median net worth for minority families during the same 3-year period went down 4.5 percent to $17,000. The difference between $17,000 and $120,000 is a stark difference. Working families of all ethnic groups are included in this great gap between rich and poor, the white working families as well as minority working families.

A key component of this budget is a stimulus package which addresses the needs of all working families with proposals for extended unemployment and health care benefits immediately, and also for creating jobs as rapidly as possible. This budget also continues to focus on certain unique needs of African American and minority communities.

Mr. Chairman, I thank all Members and staff, especially Jacqueline Ellis of my staff, who worked so diligently on producing this alternative budget.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the CBC/CPC substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this substitute because our reading is it raises taxes and increases spending, does not provide enough for defense, and fails to reach balance sooner. Having said that, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) wanted me to say that he knows the amount of time and effort that was put into this budget and also knows that there are important issues that will be brought out in this debate that this Chamber needs to hear.

So with that, I will just compliment my colleagues on working on this budget, say it is not a budget that we can support, but we look forward to listening to the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the chairman of the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to participate with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the CBC in the drafting of this CBC/Progressive Caucus budget; and I am honored to be here with my cochair, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), and I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) for the fine work that he did in this regard.

I rise in support of the CBC/Progressive Caucus budget. This is the only budget that funds universal single-payer health care. This is the only budget that fully stimulates the economy with a $300 billion economic stimulus package. This is the only budget that fully funds education. This is the only budget that fully funds transportation. This is the only budget that fully funds housing, and the only budget that fully funds veterans programs, and the only budget that fully funds the HIV–AIDS international support programs.

The CBC/Progressive Caucus budget calls on Congress to implement H.R. 676, Medicare For All. This legislation is a single-payer, universal health care plan which will guarantee access to health care, guarantee a universal high standard of care, and lower health care costs.

Earlier this month, it was reported that 75 million Americans went without health insurance in 2001 or 2002. Our failing economy and rising health care costs are failing working families who make up the majority of the uninsured Americans. While costs continue to go up, we are not getting what we are paying for. Government expenditures account for 60 percent of total health care costs. Our government spends more money per person than countries that provide universal health care. Our citizens are so close to paying for a universal health care system, but so far from getting it.

Medicare For All would first improve the Medicare program by adding coverage for all medically necessary health services, including prescription drugs. During a transition period, Medicare would subsume other health programs like Medicaid and, finally, all Americans in nongovernment programs.

It has been estimated that Medicare For All could be paid for with the same amount of money that is currently in the system. Under Medicare For All, employers would maintain a contribution to employee health care in the form of a phased-in payroll tax. This payroll tax would be less than what employers now pay on the average. And unlike current skyrocketing health care costs, this contribution would remain stable. Medicare For All would help employers by eliminating the costs associated with providing private health care coverage, including annual negotiations, annual premium increases, and administrative tasks.

Patients would benefit because copayments, premiums, deductibles and out-of-pocket payments would be eliminated for medically necessary services. Under this plan, patients would receive a card that would guarantee two things they do not now have: access to the health care they need and a universal, best standard of medical care. This would help to eliminate disparities in health care between whites and minorities.

It is time for Congress to stop trimming around the edges of the health care system. Workers, retirees, and employers are suffering together from the burdens of illnesses and increasing costs. Congress must budget for a real solution, that is, Medicare For All that is in this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for this opportunity to participate.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget resolution and in support of the joint Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus budget alternative. This alternative budget, entitled the Leave No Family Behind Budget Act, focuses national attention on spending on priorities that benefit all Americans.

It does this by funding key domestic priorities which address the needs of middle-income and working families, while fully supporting the national defense and protection of our homeland.

These priorities include education, health care, housing, child care, transportation, worker safety and protection, and business development. It would immediately repeal tax cuts for the upper-income brackets and would implement tax cuts for all families earning less than $50,000 per year.

The CBC and the Progressive Caucus budget proposal involves several balanced components. It provides Medicare For All, it provides a $300 billion economic stimulus package which includes an extension of unemployment insurance, and implements state revenue sharing; and it yields a balanced budget by 2008, at least 4 years earlier than the Republican budget.

This fiscally responsible budget freezes the 2001 tax cut in order to generate greater revenue.

□ 2030

As such, our budget provides $528 billion for a Medicare prescription drug benefit and restores the deep cuts in education by increasing funding by $20 billion over the Republican budget proposal. This means more funding for after-school programs, Head Start, Pell grants, child care programs, TRIO, Gear Up and the Leave No Child Behind Act. This means a prescription drug benefit that our seniors so desperately need.

Mr. Chairman, our budget alternative is feasible, balanced and fiscally responsible. It will get our country on the road to recovery while funding meaningful national priorities for our children, for our seniors, for our veterans and for our communities. It reflects the guiding principle that as a Nation we must come together and share the sacrifice that is required to strengthen our economy and put us on a better fiscal footing.

Unfortunately, the Republican budget is devoid of any recognition of this required sacrifice, because it provides $1.4 trillion in tax cuts to the top 1 percent of American taxpayers. I say sacrifice this tax cut, restore funding for crucial domestic programs, and get our country back on the road to economic recovery. I have to admit that I am astonished that at a time when our economy is struggling, the Republicans continue to pursue tax breaks for the affluent at any cost. Their plan is both astounding and irresponsible. The Republican budget resolution would only prolong our country's economic downturn at a time when we need the greatest investment in our infrastructure and in our people.

Mr. Chairman, in these difficult and troubling times, we have a tremendous responsibility as a Congress to protect and provide for the needs of all Americans. But I and many of my colleagues believe that the Republican budget plan callously throws that responsibility aside. The Republican-proposed $1.4 trillion tax cut is a reckless measure to pursue at this time, especially as we face war in Iraq and a continued war on terror to defend our homeland and our hometowns.

The Republicans and the President claim that tax cuts will serve to stimulate our economy, but the evidence does not support this assertion. The trickle-down tax cuts of 20 years ago did not revitalize our economy, and similar tax cuts today will not fare better. In fact, the CBO estimates that the Republican budget will add $1.7 trillion in deficits over the next 10 years after completely depleting the surplus of the Medicare and Social Security Trust Funds.

The Republican budget balances itself on the backs of Americans who can least afford it. It cuts Medicare by $214 billion over the next 10 years, Medicaid by $95 billion, veterans programs by $15 billion, while giving a meager prescription drug benefit of $28 billion to our deserving seniors. These cuts are unthinkable, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject such recklessness.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me first thank the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus for his leadership; also my colleagues the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH); and also to my staff, Julie, and all of our staffs who really worked many long hours to craft this very fair and balanced budget.

I rise in strong support of this budget, which really does provide a dramatic alternative to the Republican budget. As a member of the Congressional Black Caucus' executive committee, and also as cochair of the Progressive Caucus, I am doubly pleased to be a cosponsor of this joint alternative budget, which, in my opinion, represents the best alternative on the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, we are united today in our opposition to the irresponsible, unfair and warped priorities as expressed in the Republican budget. We cannot and we will not support a budget that spends more on defective technology than on school construction, safe drinking water, vocational education and the fight against HIV and AIDS combined. We cannot and will not support a budget that eliminates vital support for programs such as HOPE VI, the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program and brownfields redevelopment. We cannot and will not support a budget which slashes after-school programs, the school lunch program, veterans' benefits, housing programs, school loan programs, and ignores our Nation's vital need for a meaningful economic stimulus, including relief to the unemployed. Above all, we cannot and we will not support a budget that puts lavish and massive tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans above everything else, thereby mortgaging our children's future.

What we can and what we will support, however, is this reasonable and fair alternative. Our budget provides a real, fast-acting economic stimulus which includes $180 billion for payroll tax relief, $50 billion for Federal revenue-sharing with States, and $50 billion for infrastructure investment. Our budget provides health care for every single American, a benefit that no other budget offers.

Our budget also goes well beyond the Republicans' rhetorical commitment to education by providing serious resources. It fully funds the Leave No Child Behind Act, invests in substantial school construction, our Nation's teachers, vocational education and student loan programs. It also provides critical resources to our Nation's community development and housing programs. It creates a national housing trust fund, restores the administration's cuts to eliminate the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program, and it provides over $1 billion for economic and community development.

In addition to funding critical programs at home, our bill also commits substantial increases in funding toward fighting the HIV/AIDS pandemic abroad and commits $1.2 billion over the President's reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan.

How can our budget really afford to fund these priorities? It is really very simple. Instead of tax handouts to the wealthy, our budget freezes the tax cuts passed in 2001, closes corporate tax loopholes, and really does ignore President Bush's new tax cut proposals. In short, our budget has its priorities straight.

I encourage our colleagues to join me in supporting our budget. Let us support our troops tonight, Mr. Chairman, by passing this budget that says in no uncertain terms that we intend to bring you home to a country that places your economic security as our highest priority. I thank the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for this alternative and for their hard work.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2¼ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, the GOP budget sends the message loud and clear: Weapons and tax cuts are more important than people. That is bad public policy. I know it, my constituents in Marin and Sonoma Counties in California know it, and most of the people in the United States agree. It is time to look at the entire picture and put together a budget that provides support to all American families, including the men and women in our military. That is why I rise today in support of the Progressive/Black Caucus budget. Our budget includes support that American families need and support that American families deserve.

Our budget includes affordable health care, because by providing universal access for a high standard of health care, no parent will have to worry about taking their child to a doctor when that child is ill. Our budget recognizes that real support includes educational opportunities for every kid. It is not enough to pay lip service to the importance of education. Instead, this budget makes a firm commitment to provide $20 billion more for school construction, for teachers, for student loans and vocational education programs. No family, military or otherwise, will ever feel supported if their children are not receiving a top-notch education.

Speaking of the military, our budget recognizes that real support includes comprehensive care for members of our military when they return home as veterans. This budget recognizes that it is not enough to provide servicemen and women with bombs and missiles while they serve and then ignore the sacrifices they have made to protect our country when they return home. That is why the Progressive/Black Caucus budget provides over $3 billion more for funding of veterans programs than President Bush. We do not just support our troops with bombs and missiles, we support them along with all American families with access to quality health care and quality schools.

I urge my colleagues to join us in providing true support for our families by voting for the Owens-Cummings-Kucinich-Lee substitute.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2¾ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cummings-Owens-Kucinich-Lee substitute. The Republican budget contains no specific Medicare or Medicaid cuts, but the fact is it mandates a 1 percent cut in all mandatory spending, which translates to approximately 10-year cuts in Medicare and Medicaid of $215 billion and $93 billion respectively. For Illinois, this means 10-year Medicare cuts of approximately $10 billion and Medicaid cuts of more than $3 billion for the same period. Estimated cuts for my district alone are at least $1.4 billion; cuts in public housing, cuts in education, cuts in veterans' health care, cuts in Justice Department programs.

With the Republican budget, I am afraid that all of the bloodshed we shall see will not be in Iraq. All I am hearing about this budget is cut, cut, cut. I am afraid that when all you do is cut, cut, cut, all that you are going to get is blood, blood, blood. The blood of the American people will be on the hands of those who held the knife.

There are more than 2 million people in jails and prisons throughout the United States. More than 600,000 of them are being released each year. This poses a real threat and a real problem to many communities, especially low-income areas where they come from and return. The Justice Department reports that the cost of crime to victims is $450 billion annually. The proposed Republican House budget cuts Justice programs $4.1 billion below the amount needed to keep up with inflation and $881 million below the President's proposed budget. The Cummings-Owens-Kucinich-Lee budget restores the funding level back up to $3.4 billion for Justice programs and to expand reentry programs for nonviolent ex-offenders to help these individuals transition back into normal life, to get housing or jobs, social service help, to be reconciled with their families and communities, and to cut down on the recidivism rate, which is almost 50 percent.

This is a good budget, a responsible budget, and a problem-solving budget. I am pleased to support the Cummings-Owens-Lee-Kucinich amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, while we obviously have some disagreements with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle on the budgets and what our budget does, I understand my colleague has a number of speakers. We obviously do not have a number. I would be happy to transfer 10 minutes of our time to be controlled by the gentleman so he has an additional 10 minutes to control.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) will control 10 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding that time to us.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have left with our 10 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Counting the additional 10 minutes, the gentleman has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, in his speech to the Nation on Monday, the President said, ''War has no certainty but the certainty of sacrifice.'' Many in our country are sacrificing. That list begins with the hundreds of thousands of brave young men and women who as we speak are putting their very lives on the line in Iraq out of a sense of duty to their country. But there is one small group of Americans who are not only not being asked to sacrifice, but get huge new benefits in the Republican budget. That would be the millionaires, the richest of the rich, who get most of the $1.4 trillion tax cut in this Republican budget. Warren Buffett, who opposes tax cuts, would get $300 million just from elimination of the stock dividend taxes.

Sacrifice, it seems, is only for the little people. The children sacrifice. Head Start is cut. Health insurance, college loans, school lunch programs are cut. Veterans are asked to sacrifice, again. Veterans disability, education and health care benefits, cut. Seniors, cuts in Medicaid for nursing home care, and forget a meaningful prescription drug benefit under Medicare. Not enough money in the Republican budget.

□ 2045

Homeland Security, for crying out loud, a pathetic .8 percent increase, even more when we are at orange alert and even though only when 2 percent of containers are inspected at ports.

The country is hurting from a struggling economy and war, but this Republican budget shamefully pours salt in the wound. A vote for the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus budget is a vote for America's working families.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget is simply unfair and unrealistic. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have sacrificed prudence for politics. Long-term planning for short-term gain. How else can we explain $1.3 trillion in tax cuts, most of which are given to the most privileged at a time when our schools are crumbling, our veterans are being deprived of the healthcare that they need, and a $348 billion deficit.

The Republicans have proposed cutting $51 billion for the State Children's Health Insurance Program, depriving 5.3 million children of health insurance; cutting $2 billion for the Ryan White programs, depriving people living with AIDS, medical care, and social support they need; cutting $1.5 billion for community health centers, eliminating health care for millions of low-income and uninsured people; eliminating the section 8 program that provides housing for over 300 million low-income families. Even the President's No Child Left Behind education bill, which he constantly touts as a major success, is cut by 8 percent below the inactive level of funding year 2003. Homeland Security is not properly funded. As a matter of fact, it is severely underfunded, putting our police officers, firefighters, and all of our first responders in danger. Where is the compassion that the President promised during his campaign?

I support the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus alternative budget because it truly provides relief to Americans and it provides a stimulus to help the economy get back on its feet. Our budget provides healthcare for all Americans. It provides for vital infrastructure improvements throughout the Nation which provide jobs and protect America from potential terrorist threats. It provides $3.5 billion in relief to those inflicted with HIV/AIDS throughout the world, and importantly it provides our men and women in uniform the resources they need. It is indeed a balanced budget that does not burden our children with debt. We must resist this Republican budget, and I am going to urge my colleagues to support this alternative.

In conclusion, the Republican budget is an unjust and shameful budget. If Congress enacts this budget, many Americans will be harmed.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, my constituents have been paying attention to what has been going on with this preemptive strike; and when they heard about the billions of dollars offered to Turkey and other countries in exchange for their support, they said to me, Ms. WATERS, I thought we were broke. I thought we were in deficit. I thought we had no money. Where are you getting the billions of dollars from for Turkey and other countries that you are offering to them simply if they will support this preemptive strike?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Throughout the time that I have been a Member of Congress, it is always the Congressional Black Caucus that has come forward with a budget that has priorities in it that describe the aspirations that I have for this Nation: the aspirations for quality health care, for education, for economic opportunity, foreclosing of the gap between the richest and the poor, between black and white. It is the Congressional Black Caucus budget that has always been the aspirational budget and again this evening, Mr. Chairman. It is the Congressional Black Caucus budget which among all of the budgets is the best budget that has been to the floor.

In a multitrillion dollar budget, there is always going to be some parts, various things in anybody's budget that everybody can agree to. But this is the best budget that we will debate this evening. It is the most honest budget that we will debate this evening because we say point blank to the American people what my constituents are saying to me over and over again: How in the world can we be cutting taxes? How can we be cutting taxes and spending from deficit spending? How can we be cutting taxes for the richest people in America when we are going to war? And my constituents ask me that all the time. I do not have any answer for them, and some of us are honest enough to say to our constituents we think this is a bad tax cut policy. It makes no sense to turn around and cut taxes and then have a Republican budget that essentially has all of our discretionary spending in every year that we are 10 years out being funded with deficit spending. That is outrageous. That is outrageous.

So this budget is honest. It sets the aspiration for universal healthcare and coverage for all American citizens. It does not play games with it; and I submit that if we pass just the health care part of this budget, there would be so substantial a savings in our health care industry that we would see the benefit of it just from healthier people, from people getting preventative health care rather than rushing to emergency rooms and getting their health care in the most expensive and least efficient manner. That is what we have forced our people to do in this country. We aspire to a better America. That is what this budget does, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me first thank the gentleman from Connecticut who has so graciously yielded time for us to express ourselves in this august Chamber, as well as the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and of course the gentleman from Baltimore, Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Owns), the architect that put it all together.

When Governor Bush was running for President, one would think that he picked up a Democratic National Committee Campaign piece of literature. He was for education, Leave No Child Behind, prescription drugs; and when he was appointed to office by the United States Supreme Court and he got there, he had a substantial surplus in the budget, the Social Security trust fund and the Medicare trust fund. It looked like it was on its way to full recovery. But the programs that he had promised, instead of getting that, what we did get was a $1.3 trillion tax cut, most all of which went to the wealthiest Americans in our country. As a result, as we stand here today, the surplus is gone. We have no prescription drugs. We expect devastating cuts in the Republican budget. And one thing that we did not know was that we would be in war. Of course we do not like talking about that because Republicans say if one talks about money and how much the war cost that one is preempting the President from declaring the war; but now that the bombs are dropping, I assume somewhere before this debate is over, somebody would be slipping some papers to us saying what the estimated cost of the war is.

Our budget says that this is the patriotic budget. This is the antiterrorist budget. This is a budget that protects our young people on the field by saying the President did not know, I do not think he knew, that he was going onto declare war before his budget, before his 1.5 trillion tax cuts. So, therefore, what we are saying from a tax policy is let us freeze everything. Let us just put a stop to the tax cuts, a stop to the flooding of our deficit, and just take a look at what America should be all about and adopt this budget as one that is the budget of patriotism, a budget that tells the terrorists that we believe that as the President is concerned with liberating and bringing democracy to Iraq, as the President has a concern about bringing democracy to the region, as the President has a concern to capture the oil fields, increase the production, and get the revenue to improve the education and health care of the people in Iraq, that the antiterrorist patriotic budget says that we have the same commitment and a stronger commitment to the people in the United States of America to provide the health care, the affordable housing, the education to make us more productive so that we can protect this democracy.

We want to give our men and women that are fighting in the Middle East all the protection that they have today; and when they come home, we will be there to say that we fought against cutting their budgets for veterans benefits, for health benefits, and for education benefits. Vote for the patriotic budget. That is the one that is on the floor now.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican 2004 budget with its $1.3 trillion tax cuts and heavy burdens on States and territories and of course in strong support for the CBC/Progressive Caucus alternative budget. The Owens-Cummings-Kucinich-Lee CBC/Progressive Caucus substitute advances the principles of family, hard work, inclusiveness, and national solidarity by calling for increased Federal assistance for education, health care, housing, child care, and business development. It represents the values and moral principles that have made America great.

As Chair of the Health Braintrust of the CBC, I am particularly pleased that this budget reverses many of the cuts in the President's budget which are seen as an attack on programs which would address the health needs of minorities and women. Our budget also calls for the implementation of a single-payer universal health care plan which will guarantee high-standard health care at a lower cost to every person living in the United States, its territories, and commonwealths.

My colleagues, the issue of health disparities for minorities continues to be worse. Last year the Institute of Medicine released a landmark report entitled ''Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care,'' which documented key findings in areas of health care where minorities receive less than adequate care and recommended various policy changes. These recommendations are reflected in the CBC/Progressive Caucus budget, and they include increasing the budget of the Office of Minority Health, the budget of the National Center for Minority Health and Health Disparities research at the National Institutes of Health, increasing the budget of the Office of Civil Rights to reverse the low-priority status that this important office has in addressing racial and ethnic disparities in health care. It also provides increases for the health professions, including the Health Careers Opportunity program and provides scholarships and loan repayments in order to address the startling underrepresentation of people of color in the health professions.

Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity to begin to address a number of important problems facing the majority of our constituents, while at the same time providing the resources needed to support our troops and defend our homeland.

□ 2100

Let us not give tax cuts to those who do not need them. Let us invest in the American people, as this CBC Progressive Caucus budget does.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget and support the Owens-Cummings-Kucinich-Lee alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican fiscal year 2004 budget resolution and in strong support of the CBC/Progressive Caucus alternative budget. At a time when our country is facing serious threats of terrorism, as well as waging war on Iraq, my colleagues on the other side of the isle are ignoring current economic problems by continuing to incorporate $1.3 trillion in additional tax cuts while continuing to place additional burdens on the cash-strapped states.

The Owens/Cummings/Kucinich/Lee CBC/Progressive Caucus Substitute advances the principles of family, hard work, inclusiveness and national solidarity by calling for increased federal assistance for education, health-care, housing, childcare and business development. The CBC/CPC Alternative Budget represents the values and moral principles that have made America great.

As the Chair of the CBC Health Braintrust, I am particularly pleased that the CBC/CPC reverses many of the cuts in the President's budget which were seen as an attack on programs to address the health needs of minorities and women. Our budget also calls for the implementation of a single-payer universal health care plan, which will guarantee high standard health care at a lower cost to every person living in the United States, its territories and Commonwealths.

My colleagues, the issue of health disparities for minorities continues to be worse than ever. Minorities are a quarter of our population, but make-up two-thirds of all new AIDS cases. African American infant mortality is twice that of whites. Diabetes afflicts Hispanics twice as often as whites. And African American men suffer prostates cancer at a rate twice that of white men.

Last year, the Institute of Medicine, IOM, released a landmark report entitled: Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care which documented key findings areas in health care where minorities receive less than adequate care and recommended various policy changes to eliminate these unacceptable disparities.

These recommendations included specific funding increases, which the CBC/CPC budget proposes. They include increasing the budget of the Office of Minority Health; the budget of the National Center for Minority Health and Health Disparities at the National Institute of Health and increasing the budget of the Office of Civil Rights at the Departments of HHS to reverse the low-priority status that this important office in addressing racial and ethnic disparities in health care. We also provide increases for funding for Initiatives for Health Professions including the Health Careers Opportunity program, and to provide scholarship and loan repayment relief in order to address the startling under representation of ethnic and minority groups in the health professions.

Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity to begin to address a number of the major problems facing the majority of our constituents while at the same time provide the resources needed to support our troops and defend our homeland. We can only do this however if we do not follow the wrong lead of our majority colleagues and cut taxes for people who don't need it at a time when we must increase spending.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget and support the Owens/Cummings/Kucinich/Lee alternative budget.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget resolution tonight, and I strongly endorse the Congressional Black Caucus-Progressive Caucus budget resolution and our Democratic alternative.

Immediately after the Republicans passed their budget out of committee, one of the first groups that I heard from to object to their proposal was the American Legion. Representing America's honorable veterans, the American Legion stated that, ''The budget defies common sense. There must be a better way to provide tax relief to the American people than to balance the budget on the backs of disabled veterans.''

Disabled American Veterans call the House Committee on the Budget budget ''indefensible and callous.'' They represent nearly 1.3 million disabled veterans in the country, and they believe the Republican budget asks veterans to ''swallow a bitter pill to remedy an illness of their own making.''

Republicans are calling for a $15 billion cut in veteran benefits over the next 10 years. Over $800 million will be cut in health care programs for veterans next year alone. These budget cuts will impact a very large population in my own district.

I would like to just let the Members know in my own district we have over 28,000 veterans from all former wars that are still alive that reside in my district. Many are minority veterans. Mr. Chairman, 1.4 million of those veterans live in the Los Angeles County area; 2.3 million of those veterans live in the State of California.

We must keep in mind that among our troops being sent abroad right now are many young men and women representing our State of California. I know that, because I had an opportunity to meet with many of them in my district. I met three of them, three young women, two Asian women and one Latino. One was a student enrolled in college, telling me that her dream was to come back and become a teacher. The other two were in their profession. They almost had tears in their eyes, telling me that they had actually joined up to be in the Reserve unit, not knowing they would now be faced with something that was unimaginable. I pray for them, and I pray for their families.

Mr. Chairman, I know that what we are doing here tonight is very exemplary, by supporting the Black Caucus budget, the Progressive Caucus and the Democratic alternative, because we care about families, we care about the very people that are spending their time this evening defending our Nation.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me time.

First of all, let me thank the proponents of this budget. As the world watches, as the Nation watches, I believe most Americans as they pray for the troops are wondering whether or not we are caring for them and their needs.

I thank the distinguished chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, but I also thank the proponents and writers and authors of this legislation, particularly the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and any number of individuals, and, as I said, the gentleman from Maryland (Chairman CUMMINGS).

This is a budget that addresses the pain of America. It realizes that it is extremely unrealistic, Mr. Chairman, with the war looming, the needs of home-front security, to give, as the Republican budget wants to do, $726 billion in tax cuts to 1 percent of America. One percent of the rich of America will be getting the big chunk of the Republican budget.

What a tragedy that as our firefighters are laid off, police persons are not being paid and EMS services are cut back, we cannot find the good reason to have a bipartisan budget.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget and the Progressive Caucus budget deals with the pain of America. It provides additional funds for job training and family services. It ensures that education is prioritized, and it really does support No Child Left Behind.

In addition, when we talk about defense, we have unique initiatives; a defense school readiness initiative, which provides for communications equipment and training to public schools; a strategic language and culture initiative that funds higher education initiatives for the study of key languages.

Then we deal with unemployment insurance for the thousands of individuals laid off. We give them an extension in unemployment. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you, we are going to be laying off Americans.

Then with respect to health care, we believe in funding Medicaid so that the least of those who cannot get into our various health facilities will be able to do so. And we support our veterans. We do not throw them out in the street because they do not have the money.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that America is looking to this Congress tonight to be receptive to their pain and their need. Who will stand with us and vote for this legislation? I ask my colleagues to vote for this budget and vote against the Republican budget.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus for yielding me time, and especially for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus and Congressional Progressive Caucus budget, which I am proud to support.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a moment to say that there are a lot of people suffering in our Nation tonight.

The Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus believe very strongly that we must have a very balanced approach to addressing our budget concerns. On the one hand, we must be clear to protect ourselves against terrorism, and we must be clear with regard to supporting our troops. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, we must be clear in taking care of the people who have worked so hard to make this Nation the Nation that it is.

We must work hard, Mr. Chairman, and this is what the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus budget does, to help folks like Mr. Shapiro in Baltimore, who said he had been working for years on a prescription drug program, but give me something that is meaningful, because I am about to die. But maybe you can do this for my fellow people in my housing project. Or perhaps it is for the little girl in the eighth grade at West Baltimore Middle School in my district, who still is reading from a textbook where Jimmy Carter is still President. Or it might be the students who are in the honors class at another school in my district, who have no microscopes on their desks, but they are supposed to go on and become great biologists. Then the question becomes, are we taking care of all of our people?

I have often said that we have to protect ourselves from the outside, but we have to be very careful that we do not implode from the inside.

So the fact is that the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus have presented a budget tonight which is one that takes care of our health needs. It is one that truly leaves no family behind. It is one that makes sure that the young people at Morgan State University in Baltimore, where we have to let go 1,000 students every year because they do not have the money, it makes sure that they have the Pell grants that they need.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge the House to support the Black Caucus-Progressive Caucus budget.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for yielding part of his time to us. We really appreciate it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that we appreciate the work that went into the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus substitute. We understand that they, more than most Members in this House of Representatives, know that there are people suffering tonight. So we do not dispute that fact.

But we believe that the best way to help people who are suffering is first to protect America at home and abroad with a strong national defense and a strong Department of Homeland Security, to strengthen the economy, and create jobs, and to be fiscally responsible. We really believe that is the best way to help people who are suffering.

Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague and I would both agree that we would like to have a budget that is balanced today. We might come to a different conclusion as to why we have gotten to this point. The economy has slowed; I believe that September 11, a day that I will remember in infamy, had something to do with it; and we believe that the best way to get us out of this kind of lull in our economy is to provide an economic engine, which we believe are tax cuts.

So we are providing an increase in defense spending, homeland security, Social Security, Medicare and veterans. We are asking for a 1 percent reduction, a penny on the dollar, this year, in discretionary and mandatory programs. We think this 1 cent on the dollar for 1 year is something that we can do as mature and responsible Members of the Congress. Lord knows our political colleagues in the statehouses and in local communities are having to make much more difficult decisions.

I would conclude by saying that when I hear references of who is getting the taxes, we acknowledge this: That the people who pay taxes get the tax cuts. That is true. Five percent of the American people pay 50 percent of the taxes, and 50 percent of the American people pay 96.5 percent of the taxes, and they get the tax cut. But we also know when they get this tax cut, they use it to invest in America and create jobs for all Americans.

I know we have another budget to consider, so I will conclude my remarks. I appreciate the dialogue that has taken place on the floor tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to not support this budget substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 85, noes 340, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

AYES—85

Ackerman	Hinchey	Olver
Baldwin	Hinojosa	Owens
Ballance	Honda	Payne
Becerra	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Berman	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Rangel
Bishop (GA)	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Sabo
Capuano	Kilpatrick	Sanchez, Linda T.
Carson (IN)	Kucinich	Sanders
Clay	Lee	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Scott (GA)
Conyers	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Majette	Serrano
Cummings	Maloney	Slaughter
Davis (AL)	Markey	Solis
Davis (IL)	McDermott	Stark
DeFazio	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Delahunt	McNulty	Tierney
Engel	Meehan	Velázquez
Eshoo	Meek (FL)	Waters
Evans	Meeks (NY)	Watson
Farr	Millender-McDonald	Watt
Fattah	Miller, George	Waxman
Filner	Nadler	Weiner
Ford	Napolitano	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Neal (MA)	Wynn
Grijalva	Oberstar	
Gutierrez		
Hastings (FL)		

NOES—340

Abercrombie	Baca	Bartlett (MD)
Aderholt	Bachus	Barton (TX)
Akin	Baird	Bass
Alexander	Baker	Beauprez
Allen	Ballenger	Bell
Andrews	Barrett (SC)	Bereuter

Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
English
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Buyer
Dooley (CA)
Gephardt
Hyde
Lipinski
Mollohan
Thornberry
Towns
Udall (CO)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain on this vote.

□ 2132

Ms. MCCOLLUM and Messrs. UDALL of New Mexico, HEFLEY, CANNON, KANJORSKI, PALLONE, and SAXTON changed their vote from ‘‘aye’’ to ‘‘no.’’

Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Ms. MAJETTE changed their vote from ‘‘no’’ to ‘‘aye.’’

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 108–44, as modified by the special order of today.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 4 in the nature of a substitute, as modified.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 4 in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by Mr. SPRATT:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,272,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,482,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,612,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,753,572,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,871,037,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,988,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,106,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,234,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,454,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,638,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,779,210,000,000.

(B)(i) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced for the following fiscal years are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $87,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $4,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $25,000,000,000.

(ii) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased for the following fiscal years are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $15,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $12,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $17,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $25,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $27,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $40,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $27,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,831,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,867,617,000,000
Fiscal year 2005: $1,977,048,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,105,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,222,302,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,336,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,442,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,550,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,681,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,770,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,869,957,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,818,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,858,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,963,008,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,071,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,184,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,300,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,413,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,525,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,663,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,737,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,873,559,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $545,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $375,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $350,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $317,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $313,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $312,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $306,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $291,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $209,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $99,037,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $94,349,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $6,783,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $7,238,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $7,695,289,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $8,140,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $8,582,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $9,027,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $9,468,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $9,898,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $10,250,582,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $10,498,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $10,743,438,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $3,954,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $4,153,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $4,317,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $4,435,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $4,526,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $4,594,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $4,638,044,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $4,646,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $4,553,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $4,335,482,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $4,097,406,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $392,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $386,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $400,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $420,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $440,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $460,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $438,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $480,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $462,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $490,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $478,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $500,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $491,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $511,603,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $507,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $522,781,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $511,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $534,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $528,178,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $24,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $28,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $31,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $32,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $33,557,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $34,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $35,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,743,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $36,001,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $37,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,274,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $23,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $23,525,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $24,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $25,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $26,722,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $27,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $28,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $30,062,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,198,000,000.

(4) Energy (270)
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $2,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $2,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $2,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $2,613,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $2,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $2,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $2,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,182,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $3,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,295,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $30,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $32,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $33,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $34,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $35,393,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $36,272,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $37,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $38,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $39,958,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $40,980,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $42,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,032,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $24,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $27,272,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $27,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,934,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $26,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,521,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $25,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,510,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $25,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $25,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $25,038,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,695,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $8,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $7,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,588,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,062,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $8,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $8,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $8,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $9,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,723,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $9,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $9,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,878,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $64,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $66,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $67,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $68,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $70,053,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $71,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $72,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $73,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $75,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,692,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $77,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $79,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $79,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,732,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,479,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $15,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $15,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $16,152,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $16,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $16,906,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $17,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $17,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $18,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,079,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $82,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $89,231,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $90,187,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,153,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $92,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $94,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $96,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $98,047,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $100,149,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,155,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $102,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $104,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $107,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,956,000,000.

(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $231,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $227,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $238,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $236,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $253,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $253,184,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $271,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $292,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $290,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $314,333,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $312,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $337,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $335,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $363,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $360,992,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $391,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $389,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $422,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $420,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $455,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $453,522,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $248,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $261,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $262,022,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $276,023,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $319,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $316,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $351,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $351,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $379,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $379,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $409,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $409,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $441,465,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $442,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $484,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $487,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $522,221,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $518,390,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $565,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $565,794,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $322,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $329,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $322,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $324,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $332,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $333,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $340,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $349,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $350,185,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $362,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $362,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $373,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $374,367,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $386,204,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $387,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $403,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $404,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $395,443,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $396,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $410,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $412,578,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $16,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,568,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $18,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,011,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $22,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $24,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,395,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $31,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $34,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,660,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $57,597,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $62,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $67,684,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $65,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $64,709,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $68,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $70,492,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,236,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $72,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,975,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $77,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $74,059,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $78,960,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,515,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $38,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,712,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $41,193,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $39,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $40,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $40,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $42,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,668,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $43,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $44,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $46,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $47,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $48,987,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,414,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $18,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $20,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $20,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $22,361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $23,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $23,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,121,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $240,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $240,447,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $257,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $300,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $300,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $335,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $335,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $357,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $357,478,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $377,426,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $377,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $396,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $396,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $414,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $430,321,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $430,321,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $442,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $442,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $449,801,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $449,801,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $39,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $4,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $4,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $4,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $6,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $6,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $4,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,174,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $4,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $4,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $2,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $2,796,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,796,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,104,000,000.
(A) New budget authority, −$42,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$42,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$52,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$51,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$51,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$53,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$53,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$52,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$56,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$56,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$59,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$59,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$61,229,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$61,229,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT.—In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or both committees report a bill, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report thereon is submitted, which provides a prescription drug benefit under the medicare program that is voluntary, equitable, comprehensive, affordable, dependable, protects beneficiary access to drugs, and is cost effective, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall revise allocations and adjust aggregates in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, subject to section 203.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) The term ''equitable'' means that all medicare beneficiaries shall receive comprehensive prescription drug coverage and that coverage shall be accessible to all beneficiaries regardless of where they live.

(2) The term ''comprehensive, affordable, and dependable'' means that all beneficiaries shall have access to a drug benefit that contains a defined benefit and premium and coverage at all levels of drug spending, is administered through a stable and dependable delivery system so that beneficiaries will not lose coverage or face significant premium increases from one year to the next, and provides additional assistance with premiums and cost sharing to low-income beneficiaries.

(3) The term ''protects beneficiary access to drugs'' means that the benefit shall include coverage for all medically necessary drugs and shall preserve access to local pharmacies.

(4) The term ''cost effective'' means that the benefit shall include measures that lower the cost of prescription drugs and not include measures that would encourage employers to drop existing retiree coverage.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR THE UNINSURED.

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or both committees report a bill, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report thereon is submitted, that would provide affordable, comprehensive health insurance coverage to the uninsured and builds upon and strengthens public and private coverage, including preventing the erosion of existing coverage under medicaid, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall revise allocations and adjust aggregates and in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, subject to section 203.

SEC. 203. TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS TO ALLOW FOR MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT AND HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.

The total of adjustments allowed under sections 201 and 202 shall not increase the cumulative deficit or decrease the cumulative surplus (whether by changes in revenues or direct spending) by more than $131,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and $528,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013, excluding interest.

SEC. 204. CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—In the House, if the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for the budget accounts or portions thereof in the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in excess of the following amounts:

(1) for fiscal year 2004: $39,233,000,000,
(2) for fiscal year 2005: $39,998,000,000,
(3) for fiscal year 2006: $40,841,000,000,
(4) for fiscal year 2007: $41,684,000,000, or
(5) for fiscal year 2008: $42,605,000,000,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate budget aggregates and increase the allocation of new budget authority to such committee for fiscal year 2004 and for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 to the extent such excess is offset by a reduction in mandatory outlays from the Highway Trust Fund or an increase in receipts appropriated to such fund for the applicable fiscal year caused by such legislation or any previously enacted legislation.

(b) ADJUSTMENT FOR OUTLAYS.—In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that changes obligation limitations such that the total limitations are in excess of $38,594,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, for programs, projects, and activities within the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and if legislation has been enacted that satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (a) for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays for such fiscal year for the committee reporting such measure by the amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a).

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING FUNDING FOR HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the President's budget includes a total of $41.3 billion for all homeland security activities for 2004, including mandatory, discretionary, and fee-funded activities;

(2) the President's current budget does not contain any additional funding for 2003 for homeland security beyond what has already been provided; and

(3) there is need for additional homeland security resources for 2003, 2004, and subsequent years in order to protect our country against terrorist attacks.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) this resolution provides $10 billion in additional homeland security funding for 2003, and a total of $24 billion in additional homeland security funding in the years 2004-13, for a total of $34 billion above the President's request over the time period covered by this resolution; and

(2) this funding provides the resources needed to train and equip our first responders, strengthen the security of the Nation's transportation system and other critical infrastructure, increase the preparedness of our public health system, and secure our borders.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING THE CONSERVATION SPENDING CATEGORY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the fiscal year 2001 Interior Appropriations Act (P.L. 106–291), which established a separate discretionary spending category for land conservation and natural resource protection programs for the fiscal years 2001 through 2006, passed by large margins in both the House and the Senate;

(2) in establishing a separate conservation spending category, Congress recognized the chronic underfunding of programs that protect and enhance public lands, wildlife habitats, urban parks, historic and cultural landmarks, and coastal ecosystems; and

(3) the expiration of the provisions of law defining and enforcing the conservation spending category was not due to a lack of Congressional support for the programs included in the category or a loss of desire to set aside dedicated funds for those programs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that any law establishing new caps on discretionary spending should include a separate conservation spending category for fiscal years 2004, 2005, and 2006 and that total funding for that category for each of those fiscal years should be set at the levels established in P.L. 106–291.

SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING CONTINGENCY AND PRIORITY RESERVE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that this budget resolution provides a total of $54 billion of unallocated funds that have been counted as though spent, including the consequent cost of debt service.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the $54 billion reserve in this resolution should be considered to provide funding for any contingencies and priorities that may arise.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, we have had two responsible alternatives offered. Mr. Chairman, this substitute should pass, and it should pass with an overwhelming number of votes from both sides of the aisle. Why? Because it is the fiscally responsible alternative that remains on this floor.

The Republican budget is an appalling betrayal of America's values and fails to meet our Nation's priorities. We really have to wonder, how does this Republican Party define compassion? By taking hot lunches out of the mouths of poor schoolchildren? By forcing the elderly out of nursing homes as the result of Medicaid cuts? By skimping on a prescription drug benefit for seniors? By slashing veterans health care on the very day, on the very day that our brave Armed Forces have begun the battle to disarm Saddam Hussein?

It is clear that the President's irresponsible $1.4 trillion tax plan and the GOP's blind allegiance to it would be an albatross around the necks of the American people, as well as future generations.

To pay for it, the House GOP proposes to cut funding for Medicaid, student loans, scientific research, food stamps, education, and veterans benefits. Too often, those of us privileged to serve here speak in terms of billions or trillions. Well, tonight, Mr. Chairman, let us put a human face on these proposed budget cuts.

More than 90 students at the Eva Turner Elementary School in Waldorf, Maryland, who receive hot meals under the lunch program could have those meals eliminated.

Ervin Coleman of Prince George's County, who recently was forced to rely on Medicaid to cover the cost of his medical care, may not have that option under the Republican budget.

Rubin Hairston of Calvert County receives $654 a month in Social Security benefits, but his prescription drug cost is $519. He simply cannot afford all his medication. The meager funding set aside for a drug benefit in this budget offers him little hope of relief.

I ask Members, is that a budget that reflects America's values? Is that a budget that meets America's priorities? Mr. Chairman, the American people want and deserve better. That is precisely what this Democratic budget alternative gives them.

First and foremost, our budget includes our entire stimulus plan, which would jumpstart the economy, provide tax relief, and create 1 million new jobs. Our budget provides more funding for homeland security, $34 billion for safety here at home; more funding for education; and more funding for the environment, veterans, and other priorities. We also provide at least 35 percent more for prescription drugs.

Finally, our budget matches the President's defense request, protects Social Security, and achieves balance by 2010. Democrats urge all Americans to examine our budget and ask themselves which budget reflects America's values and meets our needs. The answer is clear.

The Republican budget is nothing more than a cynical, calculated political document designed solely to provide huge tax cuts to the most affluent. It will continue the deficit spiral and pass the debt along to the brave young men and women who are now in harm's way. That is not moral, it is not fiscally responsible, and it is pitiful policy.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Democratic budget for America and for generations to come.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) claim time in opposition?

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, this substitute. We have come forward with a budget that provides significant increases in defense, homeland security, Social Security, Medicare, veterans benefits. We ask for a 1 percent cut in discretionary spending for 1 year, one cent on the dollar. When our States and local communities are having to make 5 and 10 percent cuts to their budget, we are asking 1 percent; and then we allow our budget to go up each and every year after that.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, the tax cut in the Republican proposal for 2004 is a tax cut of $1.4 trillion, which is very close to the cost of the war effort. I find that not only to be interesting, but something that we need to take a look at very, very closely.

I think, when all is said and done on all of these different budget proposals, the one thing I think is absolutely sure is we have reverse socialism. What we are doing here is redistributing the wealth of this country to the top. JOHN MCCAIN was right-on when he said that 3½ weeks ago.

We have been accused on this side of the aisle year after year of trying to manipulate the budget, to manufacture the budget, so the money is going to be shifted down to those people who are making less than $50,000 a year. This is not the case over the next 10 years. We have a redistributing of the dollar upward. That is a fact of life. Yet what we have done at the same time, not because one side of the aisle thinks more of the veterans of this country than the other, but in order to fit it into their budget, what they had to do is nickel and dime the veterans, who have already put their lives on the line. Yet we send young men and women to war. What guarantee are we going to give them when they come back that their benefits are going to be intact?

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who, I would just point out, without embarrassing my colleague, is an American hero, and someone who can speak very clearly about what our men and women are going through.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I did not know if I was going to vote for this budget, but after the partisan rancor that I just heard on this floor, I am going to vote for it. It is despicable.

Talk about hurting veterans, talk about cutting Social Security. In 1993 when they had the White House, the House, and the Senate, what did they do? They spoke and talked about tax breaks for the middle class, tax breaks for the middle class. What did they do? They had the highest tax in the history of this Nation. They cut the COLAs of veterans. They cut the COLAs of our active duty military.

□ 2145

Where you said you were going to decrease the tax for the middle class, you increased the tax for the middle class. You took and utilized every dime out of the Social Security Trust Fund, and you had the gall, you have the gall to stand up here and accuse us of only for the rich.

Not a single Clinton budget after you controlled the White House, the House and the Senate ever passed this body or the other body. We brought up those budgets so that the Democrats would have to vote on them. They were so bad, and you know how many Democrats voted for it? Three. That is a fact because I will tell the gentleman, I thought we were going to have a debate, not a finger-pointing thing here tonight, and I had not planned even on speaking until I heard the speakers speak before me, and I had questions about our budget, but not after the rancor that I have heard on this floor.

You did in 1993 raise taxes. You did cut veterans' COLAs. You cut military COLAs. You raised the tax on the middle class, and now you stand here and say, oh, we want to balance a budget, and that we are responsible for the surplus, but not a single one of your policies ever passed when you had the leadership.

It is sickening to listen to this debate. The gentleman that is speaking here, normally I would and I would say even tonight his language has been honorary, and the different budgets that he has presented has been honorary, and I appreciate that, but for those that will sit up here and point fingers and say how mean the Republicans are because they want to cut veterans' COLAs or they want to hurt things is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to say that in 1993 we passed a budget. We took the deficit then in the budget, $290 billion, down every year for the next 7 years until it reached a surplus in the year 2000 of $236 billion, an exact polar opposite of what is happening right now.

Nobody in this House stands in greater admiration of the gentleman from California's (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) record in the military than I do and my personal like for the man, but I think we have to acknowledge that these fellow veterans, four different groups, have all come out in unmitigated condemnation of this budget because of what it does to veterans' benefits, and nobody shows greater indignation than the Paralyzed Veterans of America who wrote the Speaker saying, we do not consider payments to war-disabled veterans, pensions for the poorest disabled veterans and GI benefits for soldiers returning from Afghanistan to be waste, fraud and abuse.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from California may not like what Democrats are saying about the Republican budget, so let us listen to what others are saying about that budget.

Unconscionable, that is what four veterans organizations called the Republican budget. Callous, that is how the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans and Veterans of Foreign Wars describe the Republican budget. Perhaps Edward Heath, Sr., the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, said it best when he said this: ''Mr. Speaker, this budget dishonors the service of millions of service-connected disabled veterans, including combat-disabled veterans. Is there no honor left in the hallowed halls of our government?'' Well said, Commander Heath.

In just a few minutes we are going to be voting to support our troops. I must say, Mr. Chairman, to my Republican colleagues, what an odd way to support our troops when we are also going to be voting tonight, at least they are going to be voting, to cut veterans' benefits and services by $28 billion.

I would say that our veterans and our troops would appreciate it more if we supported them with our deeds, not our words, and that is why I am going to support the Spratt substitute, because the American Legion said it is a better approach. Not only does it not cut veterans' benefits, it keeps our commitments to veterans. It invests in our children's future rather than borrowing from it.

The Spratt budget, the Democratic budget, creates jobs, not deficits, for as far as the eye can see. We should vote for the Spratt budget. We should listen to the voice of the veteran leaders of America and say no to the callous budget of the Republican Party.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Democratic budget and oppose the Republican budget.

When Bill Clinton left office, we had record surpluses of $200 billion, and in two short years, we have a deficit of $300 billion, deficits as far as the eye can see.

Yes, there was a downturn in the economy. Yes, 9/11 caused part of it, but a large part of it were those tax cuts. What are the Republicans giving us now? More tax cuts for the wealthy as far as the eye can see.

Never in American history has there been a proposal for tax cuts at the time of war. This is so fiscally irresponsible that I just cannot believe it. We are leaving a legacy of debt to our children and our grandchildren, and the Republicans want to give us deeper and deeper and deeper debt and dig us deeper into a hole.

There is no economic growth in the Republican budget. There is no real drug plan in the Republican budget. The Democratic budget has $128 million more for prescription drugs, $34 billion more for homeland security. The Republican budget gives us cuts to veterans and schools and Medicaid and to our senior citizens.

The Democratic budget is responsible. The Republican budget subordinates all other priorities to additional lavish tax cuts. Vote for the Democratic budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished ranking member for yielding me the time.

We have talked a lot about what is in the budget. I would like to talk about two things that are not in the budget. The first particularly should be of interest to people who live in Washington State, my home State, Tennessee, Texas, Nevada, Wisconsin, Florida or South Dakota.

Residents of those seven States are unjustly treated in the Tax Code, and this budget does nothing to correct it. Those States rely on sales tax to fund their State governments, but they are not allowed to deduct their sales tax from their Federal tax return as one is allowed to deduct their State income tax.

What that does is it disadvantages our State. The Federal Government essentially tells our States how we should tax our citizens. I believe it is an issue of State rights.

The Democratic Party introduced an amendment to the budget bill to fix this. Regrettably, the other side voted that down.

The second thing that is not made allowance for in this budget is fixing the Medicare payment imbalance. Forty-seven percent of physicians in my home State, in Washington, will not see new Medicare patients. Why? Because the fee-for-service rates under Medicare are unjust. This is the case in the Committee on the Budget chairman's home State of Iowa.

We had an opportunity to provide language in this bill to fix it. We managed to provide language to protect tax cuts, but we do not seem to be able to provide language to protect people for tax fairness, and we do not seem to be able to provide language to assure fair Medicare compensation rates.

I urge the people from those States to ask their Representatives, why have they left us out in the cold? Why have they not solved the sales tax inequity? Why have they not fixed the imbalance in Medicare payments?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the distinguished chair of our caucus.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and for his work.

The budget is more than a series of numbers. It is about priorities and values and visions and commitments. It is about the kind of America we want to build. It is about the kind of Nation we want to bequeath to our children. It is about the future.

Will we have a future of debts and deficits or a future with a balanced budget? Will we have a future where seniors have access to the medications they need, or one where they will have to choose between life-saving prescriptions and putting food on the table? Will we have a future where every child gets the education he or she deserves, or one where many children arrive into adulthood unprepared for the jobs and challenges of the 21st century? Will we have a future where Medicare and Social Security are there for our retirees, or one where the funding runs out? Will we have a future where our cities and States have funding they need to hire, train and supply our local first responders, our first line of defense against terrorism, or will we leave them and their communities defenseless? Will we have a future where our veterans have all of the benefits and services they need and deserve, or will we have a future where their sacrifices go unappreciated?

On every single count, the Democratic plan provides a future where the priorities and values of the American people are met and fulfilled, and on every single count the Republican budget shortchanges these priorities of the American people by sacrificing them on the altar of a massive round of additional tax breaks and tax cuts. Their budget makes no fiscal sense, it makes no moral sense, and it makes no practical sense.

We are, as I speak, as we debate, at war. Our men and women in uniform are fighting for our way of life, and we all stand behind them in their mission, but the Republican budget cuts $14.6 billion from mandatory veterans' benefits, including disability, burial benefits, pensions, rehabilitation, housing and education, and that is a disgrace, a disgrace. Our soldiers are fighting to protect our way of life, and Democrats believe we have a duty to protect them.

Fiscally irresponsible tax breaks are not the answer to every problem. I believe our way of life is about more than just tax giveaways. Our way of life is about educating our children, taking care of the needs of our seniors, and building an America we can all be proud of.

The Democratic budget takes care of these priorities. The Republican budget does not. It is that clear, it is that simple, and the choice for Members is to vote for a future with promise and hope, or vote for a future with massive debt and broken commitments.

I urge my colleagues to look into their hearts, make the right choice and support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me the time, and I want to agree with my friend from New Jersey, the previous speaker. This debate is about where our priorities are, and a budget is about where our priorities are in government, and we just have a disagreement on the floor of the House of Representatives. We have it year after year after year.

Clearly, my friends on the Democrat side of the aisle are willing to accept higher taxes so that Federal spending can increase at a faster and faster rate. That is their viewpoint. We, on the other hand, believe that tax restraint brings about economic growth and jobs, and that is a lot of what this debate is about tonight.

I have heard debate on this bill throughout the afternoon and evening, and I have heard things like the Republican budget slashes spending, we are taking hot meals away from schoolchildren, we are taking needed benefits away from our citizens, we are denying health care. Someone just said we are leaving people out in the cold. These are the very same arguments that we have heard year after year after year, debate after debate, on the budget resolution.

□ 2200

I would submit to my colleagues that hot meals have not been taken away from school children, benefits have not been taken away from our citizens, we have not denied health care or left people out in the cold.

With regard to slashing spending, I would like Members to look at chart number 26 which shows spending trends. Since I became a Member of this Congress in 1995, spending has gone up at a quite remarkable rate. All we are asking with regard to discretionary spending from the year 2003 to the year 2004 is just a very, very modest breather. After that discretionary spending continues to increase at a pace which probably would embarrass some of our conservatives. But this is the definition of slashing spending for some of our colleagues. So we need to decide if that is exactly what this is.

Moving to the next chart, a statement was made about the Clinton tax increase, and I hope Members can see this. I have a different view and I have a different recollection about the Clinton tax increase and the result of it. When I got to Congress in the winter of 1995, President Clinton, who had just presided over a very large tax increase, came before the Congress and proposed his budget. I did not see a balanced budget at the end of that rainbow. I saw deficits as indicated on this line as far as the eye could see. As a matter of fact, under the Clinton budget after tax increases, the deficit would have gone up to $288 billion per year.

Now Republicans in the House of Representatives and the Senate felt we could do a better job, and part of that solution was tax reductions. Indeed, we did reduce taxes. And guess what, we said we will balance the budget by restraining spending, by making some of those tough decisions which other people criticized as slashing and leaving people out in the cold. Lo and behold, in a shorter time than we even predicted, we had a balanced budget.

Looking at the last chart, we seek tax reduction for one reason and one reason only, to grow this economy. I want to remind Members of a time when we were spending a larger percentage of the gross domestic product on national defense than we are today, a larger percentage of the economy than we are having to do in this Iraq situation, and that was in 1981 and 1982 when President Reagan ushered in a very meaningful tax cut for the American people. Did we have to slash programs? As a matter of fact, revenue grew almost every year after the Reagan tax cuts because the economy grew. That is what we are trying to do with our tax policy here.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman put up the chart that was up earlier showing Clintonomics versus the last chart and agree that perhaps spending grew in those years because revenue for the government grew as well, and perhaps that President and this Congress, Democrats and Republicans, did a darn good job of helping the economy to grow. Can the gentleman concede that point?

Mr. WICKER. Reclaiming my time, I would concede this, that President Reagan raised taxes and the very next year he was up here proposing deficits as far as the eye could see.

When we cut taxes, as President Reagan did, the economy grows. These are simply the facts. Revenues to the government grew because people had jobs and they were working. I urge a defeat of this Democrat proposal, and a ''yes'' vote on final passage.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me follow up on what the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) stated. I was here in 1993, and I voted for that. It was the hardest vote I ever made, but it worked. And it was not because of the Republican majorities in 1995. It was because of a bipartisan effort that we had a balanced budget and surpluses in the late 1990s. Now they are gone.

That is why I rise in opposition to the Republican budget and support the Spratt substitute amendment. This Republican budget does not provide enough. We know what we are going to have to pay for the military campaign in Iraq, which could range as high as $100 billion, and which programs will have to be cut to underwrite that $100 billion. What we know about this budget is it contains a monstrous tax cut that is paid for out of the expense of almost everything, including veterans, the war effort, prescription drugs for seniors. Let me repeat that. This tax cut affects some of the most critical entitlement programs, school lunches, student loans, veterans programs, and Medicaid and Medicare.

In my own committee, we are asked to cut $107 billion out of Medicaid and literally give pennies to prescription drugs to seniors. That is why the Spratt substitute is so good.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, just to walk down memory lane, during the Clinton years, we created 21 million jobs. So far, during the Bush years, we have seen 2.5 million private sector jobs disappear. In December 2000 before President Clinton left office and President Bush took office, there were 5.17 million people unemployed. This year in January 2003, it is 8.4 million unemployed.

We can go down the list. Real GDP during the Clinton years increased at a rate of 6.3 percent from 1993 through 2000. So far it has increased at a rate of 1.5 percent, and the budget every year from 1993 onward, the bottom line of the budget, the so-called deficit got better and better and better under that budget that we adopted in 1993. It went from a record deficit of $290 billion in 1992 to $255 billion the next year, $203 billion the next year, $164 billion in 1995, $107 billion in 1996, $22 billion in 1997, and balanced for the first time in 30 years in 1998. That was a record of that period of time and the result of that tough budget vote that we took in 1993.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, immoral. Immoral is the only word I can find to describe the Republican budget that is being forced down our throats this evening.

As we go to war, this Republican package includes exactly zero dollars towards the war effort. This budget includes exactly zero dollars to bolster our troops in Iraq and throughout the Middle East. And for our veterans, this Republican budget cuts funding for veterans disability pensions and veterans health care.

The Disabled American Veterans asked the question: Has Congress no shame? Unfortunately, as long as Republicans control this institution and force these types of budgets onto the American people, the answer is no, this Republican Congress has no shame.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I believe this budget is immoral, and that is the only word I can find to describe it. Tax cuts for the rich, cuts to veterans' pensions and health care and nothing for our troops. I say vote down this immoral Republican budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I know it is getting late. It is 10 p.m., but words like ''immoral'' and not providing money to our troops is just over the edge. Our troops are going to get all the money they need to do whatever they have to do to protect themselves and achieve their objective. There is no one here doubts that issue. Not one Member. To suggest otherwise, I think particularly tonight, is inappropriate. I do not think that we need to go there.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) said that States are having to make cuts, and you do not see why it is not possible that we in this Congress cannot take a 1 percent across-the-board cut.

I could accept that, but the only problem is where the gentleman did not cite the difference between the States and us is that they are not parading around talking about tax cuts in Tennessee, Connecticut, Michigan, Florida and New Mexico.

Mr. SHAYS. Reclaiming my time, I understand there is an objection to the tax cuts. I understand that debate is going to be one in which we will disagree. We happen to believe that tax cuts generate economic activity. We have an honest disagreement on that issue.

I am just saying in this debate tonight when our men and women are fighting to even suggest for a moment that our troops are not going to get all of the resources they need is simply going over the edge. I would just suggest that we both know that we need to provide our men and women with everything they need, and our job is to make sure it is never a fair fight, that we always have the advantage, and we have done that.

I think the gentleman would acknowledge that this side of the aisle has continually put more money into the defense budget. That is what we continue to do today. I just would make this point. Our men and women are going to get whatever they need, and we are going to have a supplemental that impacts this budget, not next year's budget. They will get whatever they need to do their job and win this war.

We have disagreements. Our disagreements are we are putting more money in defense and homeland security. We believe a meaningful tax cut, one that is noticeable and large, will strengthen the economy and create jobs; and we believe that a 1 percent cut on nondefense, nonhomeland security discretionary spending, 1 percent for 1 year will make sense. What my colleague from South Carolina did not point out is during the late 1990s, we slowed the growth in spending for 2, almost 3, years, and then allowed it to go up again. We believe that is why our budget balanced. We are going to have disagreements on that.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enthusiastically support the Spratt substitute amendment on the budget because of its commitment to child care, education, Medicare and Medicaid, and because it helps ease the pain of working Americans.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican's proposed budget resolution for fiscal year 2004 and in support of the Spratt substitute amendment. If passed, the budget resolution currently before the House would require the Committee on Education and the Workforce to cut mandatory spending programs under its jurisdiction by $269 million for fiscal year 2004 and $2.675 billion for fiscal years 2004 through 2008. This is completely unacceptable. Education is the key to success.

The Federal cuts come at a time when States are facing a severe budget crisis. According to the National Governors' Association, States face a combined $80 billion budget shortfall for fiscal year 2004 in addition to a $30 billion shortfall for the current fiscal year.

In my State of Texas, they are suffering from at least a $10 billion shortfall in this 2-year period.

As I see it, all of these cuts to essential educational programs are being made only to benefit the wealthiest Americans—the top 1%—through tax cuts. The President and the Republican party insist on cutting taxes far beyond any reasonable amount at a time when we are at war with Iraq and will need to occupy Iraq for years to come to maintain the peace and rebuild the country. They are acting irresponsibly by failing to include the projected cost of the war and its aftermath in this current budget resolution. The cost of the war alone has been estimated at anywhere from $70 billion to $200 billion, according to the Administration's former economic advisor, Lawrence Lindsay.

The Republican budget also cuts $28 billion in health care and disability benefits for military veterans again to pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans less than 24 hours after sending our forces into battle. They should be ashamed of themselves. It is unconscionable for the Republicans to be cutting taxes and reducing social services programs at a time when the United States has a large and growing deficit, our states are in crises, and we are at war with Iraq. History will not be kind when it judges the Republicans' actions.

There is a far better alternative budget. Congressman SPRATT's Democratic substitute offers real economic stimulus and job creation. It proposes responsible tax policy by continuing the implementation of middle-income tax cuts, such as the increased child tax credit, and by freezing tax cuts for the top two income tax brackets. The Spratt substitute meets our nation's domestic needs by providing over $200 billion more in domestic investments than the Republican budget. It fully funds priority investments such as No Child Left Behind, IDEA, veteran's benefits, children's services, public health, transportation, environmental programs and agricultural programs. This alternative also invests in health care and a strong prescription drug plan by providing at least $20 billion to cover the uninsured and at least $528 billion for a prescription drug program under Medicare, while allowing senior citizens to stay with their current doctors. Finally, the Spratt alternative budget invests in Homeland Security and defense funding by increasing resources for Homeland Defense and by giving $20 billion more to First Responders than they would receive under the Republican Budget. In short, the Spratt Budget provides for America's needs, the needs of our people and strengthens our economy. It is a sound, reasonable budget blueprint, and we should support it.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican's proposed budget resolution is inherently flawed. It hurts the education system in the United States. It harms children's programs. It damages small businesses, which are the strength of the U.S. economy, and it insults our veterans and our troops fighting in Iraq. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Spratt substitute and oppose the irresponsible, illogical, and ill-advised Republican budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) mentioned not tonight, we do not walk the talk about what is happening to our veterans and military tonight. What better time to pull the covers off and show exactly what this Republican Party is doing for our veterans.

□ 2215

How in the name of any degree of decency and respect can we, on a day that will certainly live in infamy in the hearts of veterans, on a day and a time that we are sending our men and women into battle, what reward do we want to give our veterans who had to remember a day in infamy 60 years ago? What do we want to give them? A $17 billion cut for veterans.

I represent the State of Georgia. I say to my friends in the Republican Party, and I want you to know that every weekend I go home that my office is lined with veterans with tears in their eyes, saying, how could they be so mean? Every year in campaigns my Republican friends run around the country, and they talk about conservative compassion. This is not conservative compassion. This is downright conservative meanness. These veterans do not appreciate it. This is why I say, let us support the Democratic budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, as a Democrat who voted for the 2001 Bush tax cut, I am here tonight to say that I would never support a vote for this Republican budget proposal. The Republican budget completely abandons the goal of a balanced budget. It embraces deficits and debt. It slashes critical programs for our working families, and it is fiscally irresponsible. The Republican budget would mean a cut of hundreds of millions of dollars from Nevada's hospitals and health care providers due to cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. Nevada already has a health care crisis. We cannot afford these cuts in medical care for our elderly and our poor.

The Republican budget eliminates after-school programs for over 2,900 children in Nevada. Southern Nevada has one of the highest dropout rates in the country. Abandoning these kids who are struggling to stay in school would be a disaster. The Republican budget cuts almost 8 percent from highway funding. In Nevada, the fastest-growing State in the country, this translates into a $16 million cut and represents a loss of more than 760 construction jobs for Nevada.

At a time that our Nation is going to war, the Republican budget cuts $28 million from the veterans budget. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Spratt proposal and not the Republican budget debacle.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, there are words we should remember. There are quotes worth quoting again. Here is one:

''If we are to prevail in the long run, we must expand the long-run strength of our economy. We must move along the path to a higher rate of growth and full employment.

''For this would mean tens of billions of dollars more for each year in production, profits, wages and public revenues. It would mean an end to the persistent slack which has kept our unemployment at or above 5 percent for 61 of the past 62 months.''

''To achieve these greater gains, one step, above all, is essential, the enactment this year of a substantial reduction and revision in Federal income taxes.

''For it is increasingly clear, to those in government, business and labor who are responsible for our economy's success, that our obsolete tax system exerts too heavy a drag on private purchasing power, profits and employment. Designed to check inflation in early years, it now checks growth instead. It discourages extra effort and risk. It distorts the use of resources. It invites recurrent recessions, depresses our Federal revenues, and causes chronic budget deficits.''

''This net reduction in tax liabilities will increase the purchasing power of American families and business enterprises in every tax bracket, with the greatest increase going to our low-income consumers. It will, in addition, encourage the initiative and risk-taking on which our free system depends, induce more investment, production and capacity use, help provide the 2 million new jobs we need every year, and reinforce the American principle of additional reward for additional effort.''

Mr. Chairman, there are Democrats that we should quote, there are Democratic words that we should remember, and those that I have just quoted came from the Democratic President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in his State of the Union message in 1963.

There is a contemporary Democrat who offers to his party also very good advice. It, of course, is Democrat Bill Richardson from the State of New Mexico, who says that ''reducing taxes,'' and this year he is talking about, this is not in 1963, he is talking about 2003, ''reducing taxes puts us on the road to economic growth.'' His plan reduces New Mexico's income tax by 40 percent, from the current 8.2 percent to 4.9 percent. He agrees that his plan sounds sort of like the Bush tax-cutting agenda.

All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is this. There was a time when the Democratic Party could be counted on to do the right thing for the government, to do the right thing regardless of whether or not you could make a class envy debate out of this thing. They knew it was the right thing to do. It was the right thing to do when the President of the United States said so in 1963, it is the right thing to do today when the Democratic Governor of New Mexico says to do it, and I encourage this body to do it by striking down this substitute and supporting the underlying amendment.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would remind my good friend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) that Governor Richardson in New Mexico, we applaud him for what he has done.

There are many on this side who believe that tax cuts should be a viable part of any stimulus plan. The only problem is the tax cut that you propose we do not believe will actually stimulate very much, nor will it help us to achieve the balanced budgets that my friend the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) claims he wants, and I believe that he actually wants, even though he was a bit condescending when he told me to shut up a few seconds ago.

I will say this to my friend, Bill Richardson and other Governors across this Nation, Bill Richardson was here a few days ago along with Governor Bush and another Governor, talking about Medicaid dollars and complaining to this Congress that the cuts we are imposing on his hospitals in his State as well as Governor Bush's State and other States are far too onerous.

All we ask on this side is that we be honest about the moment we face. Many of us on this side have rallied behind this President and our Commander in Chief in this effort against Iraq and this war on terrorism. I resent my friend the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), for whom I have great affection, for some of the words. I understand the passion sometimes, it happens to me, it gets to us and perhaps allows our words to get away from us. I am sure he did not mean some of the personal things he said this evening.

Our budget, I believe, we believe, is better for the country than yours. It is about priorities. Next election cycle we will see who is right, but I can tell this to the gentleman from Connecticut, I want to win this war, I want to see this economy grow, and I can assure you that everyone on this side of the aisle wants that as well. We just think our budget is better.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, here is the dilemma we are faced with. If this budget passes and becomes real, which I doubt, it will be devastating to our children and their education, to our seniors and their security, and to some of the most worthy citizens we know, sick and disabled veterans. On the other hand, if it passes and does not become real, if those cuts are not actually made, then it will devastate the bottom line of our budget.

Those of us who have been here a long time can tell you how intractable deep deficits can become. For 15 years we struggled to get ourselves in surplus, and in 2 years we have blown it. That is why we are out here intensely tonight fighting. Important principles are at stake.

I have to say to my colleague and wonderful friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), when I first saw this budget on the day of markup, I said, ''It ain't on the level. I can't take it at face value.'' The better I understand it, the less credence I give it. I honestly think it is just a clever device for passing another round of tax cuts as large as the last, $1.35 trillion, despite the fact that this time there is no surplus. It goes straight to the bottom line and increases the deficit.

Here the numbers are displayed on this chart. If you want a choice between us and them, here it is, Mr. Chairman. Here it is, colleagues. Our budget every year has a lower and lower deficit until the year 2010 when it is no longer in deficit, it is in surplus. We put the budget back in surplus. That is our driving purpose. The first parameter we set for ourselves was we are going to get to balance in a reasonable period of time, and that date turned out to be 2010.

If you compare the Republican chart, you will see they do not get to balance until the year 2012, 2 years later, and that depends, Mr. Chairman, on some stupendous cost-cutting around here. I have been here 20 years. I just do not think that they are going to be able to accomplish it.

I heard these colloquies over here on the House floor. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), one of the ablest Members of this House, chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, he had a colloquy that, in effect, said, you don't expect me really to get $40 billion out of government retirement pensions, do you? The answer was basically, no, you've got other mandatory programs. You can reform procurement, for example, and save $40 billion.

Give me a break. That is not going to happen. This is a serious, serious effort and exercise, because if we are wrong here, we will live with the consequences for a long, long time.

We have before us a real choice to this budget which we have brought to the House floor from the House Budget Committee. We have got a choice that is a far better choice, the Democratic substitute. It is a fiscally sound choice because our budget balances in 2010; theirs balances in 2012. Our budget racks up less debt during that 10-year time frame, $913 billion less debt, and, listen to this, $1.647 trillion less debt than the President's budget.

Our budget is fair and sensible. The Democratic budget weighs priorities. The Republican budget wreaks havoc. Indeed, much of our budget is devoted to restoring the damage the Republican budget does.

The Republican budget cuts education and training by $60 billion. It flat-funds Leave No Child Behind, even though the authorizing act calls for $9 billion next year. We restore that cut and add to the education function.

The Republican resolution wipes out Justice Department programs like community policing. We can all attest to its effectiveness. It drops and cuts out Byrne grants. It drops level funding for these Justice Department programs by $35 billion. Do you know who you are cutting when you are doing that? The famous first responders. These people that we talk about, but do so little for, they are the victims. We do not stand for that in our budget. We restore those programs because we think this is the first line of homeland defense, and we put $24 billion more in our budget than they do for homeland security.

We have heard it charged on the floor today that our budget increases spending. Let me just lay that argument to rest once and for all with a chart that is taken straight from the numbers in our budget. As you can see, this year we are spending about 20.4 percent total spending of GDP. Following the path laid down by our budget, that will decline to 19.1 percent of GDP in 2013. In the years 2004 through 2013, the 10-year time frame of this budget, our spending will grow by 4.6 percent over that 10-year period of time. That will be the annual rate of growth. That is less than the GDP nominal growth rate.

Let me finally say that our bill also has in it something that is critically important. We have got a weak, wobbly economy. We have got in our bill the stimulus package, which we think is an excellent package. It was offered by us on January 6 of this year. We say, let us enact it. Let us help those who are unemployed, let us give this economy a kick, let us give those who are likely to spend it a rebate straight to their pockets. It will be spent on the economy. Let us give small businesses extra expensing. Let us help large businesses by saying, if you will do something in 2003, we will give you a 50 percent depreciation.

It is dramatic, it is bold, and when you compare it by any of the established economic models, we get two to three times the results in GDP growth and job creation that the Republicans get for spending six times as much money in their jobs and growth package.

We have a real choice, a stark choice today, and far better the choice is our Democratic substitute. Vote for the

Spratt substitute. Vote for the Democratic substitute. It is the best choice by far.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this Democrat budget. I find it fascinating that we have so much angst about the deficit on this side of the aisle. I have a lot of angst about the deficit. I do not want to leave our children a legacy of debt. I have a 1-year-old. I want to leave them a legacy of freedom and opportunity. But, Mr. Chairman, the tax relief in the Republican package accounts for less than 5 percent of this budget.

□ 2230

If there is so much angst over the deficit, why does the Democrat budget not focus on 95 percent of the problem, which is spending? Our budget increases spending, increases it by 3 percent. How much is enough? Over 5 years we have increased the VA, HUD, and independent agencies by 35.7 percent, Transportation by almost 80 percent, HHS by 96 percent. If every Government program was so great for the American people, why do we not simply double these budgets? Why do we not triple these budgets? Why do we not quadruple the budgets? Why do we not tell the American people to quit sending us State, local, and Federal taxes of 40 percent? Why do they not just send it all to us?

The point we are making is that good things can be done perhaps outside of this Government. I mean, the Democrats talk and accuse us of cutting programs. It is their budget that cuts education programs. It is their budget that cuts housing programs because in our budget we help American families pay for their programs. Our budget is going to allow 46 million married couples to keep over $1,700 more of what they earn. That is enough to pay two mortgage payments. That is a housing program and the Democrat budget cuts it.

Under our budget, 34 million families with children would keep an additional $1,500, enough to purchase a personal computer for their children. That is an education program and the Democrat budget cuts it. Six million single mothers would keep $541. That is enough to purchase a month of daycare. That is a childcare program. And the Democrat budget cuts it.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot tax our way into prosperity, spend our way into prosperity, or sue our way into prosperity; and we need to reject this Democrat budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his distinguished leadership in putting together the Spratt proposal this evening.

I rise in strong support of the Spratt budget resolution and in opposition to the Republican budget on the floor tonight. I want to congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his great leadership. I also want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) for his leadership on the Congressional Black Caucus budget and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for his leadership on the Blue Dog budget. All three of these Democratic budgets are far superior to the Republican proposal.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that our Federal budget should be a statement of our national values. We should allocate our resources to those proposals that are important to us.

Let me ask my colleagues, is it a statement of your values to cut funding in the education of our children in order to give a tax cut to the wealthiest in America? I did not think so. America's children deserve better.

Is it a statement of your values to give a meager drug prescription benefit and cut nursing home care to America's seniors while giving the most of the tax breaks to those who need it least? I did not think so either. America's seniors deserve better.

Is it a statement of your values to cut funding for America's disabled veterans and not include one penny for a war budget as we send our young men and women into harm's way? America's veterans and servicemen and women deserve better.

Is it a statement of your values to underfund Homeland Security while we are on high alert? The American people deserve better.

The Republican budget is clearly not a statement of our national values. It explodes the deficit, fails to create jobs, and fails to invest in the education and health care initiatives that this country needs for long-term economic growth.

I commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his masterful leadership in developing a Democratic budget that creates jobs, in fact, 1 million new jobs this year. The Spratt proposal balances the budget, sparks economic growth, funds the priorities of working families, education for their children, prescription drugs for their parents and grandparents, health care for our veterans, and resources for the police and firefighters who protect our communities.

This Democratic budget invests in our children. The Republican budget indebts them. This Democratic budget gives the American people the responsible budget they deserve. The Republican budget is reckless and irresponsible. On every measure important to working families, the Democratic budget is better.

We will fight this unconscionable Republican budget at every opportunity. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on Spratt.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It is getting late. I know we are going to have a 2-hour dialogue of strong support for our men and women in battle. I would like to conclude by making a number of points, but not using all my time.

First, there is really no one I respect more on either side of the aisle than the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), and I appreciate the graciousness in which he does his business and the conviction with which he expresses it and the work that he and his staff and his members do.

My comments are meant to just explain differences and not to describe character; but when we were debating this bill last week, we looked at amendments to the budget that only increase spending. We did not see any Democratic amendment that cuts spending. Admittedly, they reduce the tax cuts and therefore added more taxes than we would have. That is true. But there was $1 trillion of more spending, and I would submit that during the 20 years that my colleague talks about serving in this Congress, the only time he ever saw Congress balance the budget was under a Republican Congress. He never saw it happen under a Democratic Congress. He never saw a debt paid back under a Democratic Congress. So I understand that we have clearly been very proud of the fact that we on the Republican side of the aisle, working with Democrats, balanced the budget and started to pay down debt and now we have gone in a different direction.

It does not surprise me, though. The economy has slowed down. We had a horrific attack on September 11, 2001, that I think most people know had an impact on the budget. Ten percent of our gross domestic product came to a standstill with the airline industry and tourism. So we all understand that. We just have a difference in how we generate economic activity because both sides recognize that we ultimately balance the budget by growing this economy and getting more revenue. That is what we know happened. And the difference is a 1 percent reduction in mandatory and discretionary nondefense, nonhomeland security, non-Social Security, non-Medicare that we think is something that grown men and women can do. And when my colleagues on that side of the aisle ascribe a cut in a particular part of the budget, what they had to do was they had to assume that we were going to cut more than 1 percent and where we were going to make that cut was in the particular area they wanted.

The disadvantage we have is that we decided to allow the appropriators to make that decision, unlike what we did in the Committee on the Budget I was on a few years ago in 1996 and 1997 where we specified those cuts, we said the appropriators can make those decisions, and I am absolutely certain that in most instances described on the other side of the aisle, those cuts would not be made there. That is what I believe because we are talking about a 1 percent cut in 1 year and then we allow the budget to grow the next year and the next year and the next year and the next year. Nine years we allow it to grow, but our logic is make the reductions this year because then we see benefit in all the years that follow.

Maybe it is hard here, but when I was in the Statehouse and on the Committee on Appropriations for 13 years, we sometimes had to reduce the budget by 5 percent or more; and what we did is we sat down with the department heads and said, This is what we have got to do, where would you like the cuts to be? We met with our version of GAO and said, Where do you think it should be? Our version of the Inspector Generals, and we put it all together, and we came down with where we thought the cuts should be. A 1 percent reduction 1 year is what we are asking for.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would just say we do want to protect America. We do want to increase the defense budget and homeland security, and we do. We do want to strengthen the economy and create jobs. We do it by a tax cut. On the other side of the aisle, you do it by spending increases and a much smaller tax cut, and we ultimately want to balance the budget and now your budget will balance 2 years sooner under a static model. We believe under a dynamic model when we restrain spending and we have tax cuts, we will see it balance sooner.

We saw that happen in 1990. We did not get credit in 1990 when we had our 7-year plan to balance the budget. The CBO would not give us credit, but we balanced it in 3 years, 4 years sooner than we thought.

You may not agree with what I have said, but that is the reality as we see it, and that is the differences we have, and they are honest disagreements; but the one thing we do not have a disagreement on, and that is what I was trying to explain to my colleague. Our men and women are going to get whatever they need to win whatever war they are fighting and to make sure it is never a fair battle. On that Republicans and Democrats are totally and completely united. Totally and completely.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the budget proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT. The Republican majority of the House Budget Committee approved a federal budget reducing funding for veterans' health care and benefit programs by nearly $25 billion. The actual spending impact of these cuts would be even greater.

Over a ten-year period the GOP is proposing a cut of almost $9 billion in veterans' health care—an average of more than $900 million less than the President has proposed per year. For other veterans' benefits, including cash payments to veterans disabled by military service, the Republican budget calls for a $15 billion cut in spending from current levels during the next ten years.

In sharp contrast to the Republican's proposal, the Committee on Veterans Affairs, on a bipartisan basis, recommended adding $3 billion to the President's budget next year for veteran discretionary programs including medical care and research, construction, and programs that fund the administrative costs of other important benefits such as compensation, pension, and education programs. A group of Veterans Service Organizations who support the Independent Budget also recommend an increase over the President's budget of almost that much.

The Republicans also spurned other efforts to increase funding for the nation's veterans. An amendment in the Budget Committee offered by DARLENE HOOLEY to add $1 billion for veterans' health care and restore cuts in mandatory programs was voted down on a largely party-line vote.

Passing the Republican's budget will mean serious problems for veterans' health care. Among them, Congress will have to seriously consider the new copayments and enrollment fees proposed by the Bush Administration in order to keep the system operating in the next fiscal year. Some of these proposals include retaining the ineligibility for new Priority 8 veterans for VA health care services indefinitely, requiring Priority 7 and 8 veterans to have an annual enrollment fee in addition to increased copayments for pharmaceutical drugs and primary care and providing only veterans with highly rated service-connected disabilities (more than 70 percent) VA Nursing Home care.

In addition, passage of the Republican's budget would mean there would be no additional funds available to implement the Homeless Veterans Comprehensive Assistance Act to work toward the goal of elimination chronic homelessness in a decade. It would also mean that the current exercise Capital Assets Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) that VA is undertaking to assess the best use of its physical infrastructure will become a ''de facto'' closure commission with no ability to respond to veterans' needs for primary care, long-term care, and mental health projected by its own models. There would be little money leftover for any of the system's desperately needed construction projects.

As serious as the problems for health care would be, the implications of the scheduled cuts for veterans' benefits would be even worse. The Administration's Budget for 2004 makes no provision for additional service-connected disability benefits resulting from the present war with Iraq. As we know from the last war in the Persian Gulf, war results in adverse health effects and justifiable claims for service connected disability compensation. It does acknowledge the expected increase in veteran's claims and an expected worsening of the disabilities of some service-connected veterans. Under these circumstances, cuts in mandatory spending can only be made by cutting benefits to veterans with service-connected disabilities.

Ninety percent of the mandatory spending the Budget Committee proposes to cut is from cash payments to service disabled veterans, low-income wartime veterans and their survivors. I do not believe that as our young men and women are fighting in Iraq and defending freedom in other parts of the world, we should pass a budget which will not fully compensate them for any disabilities they acquire during, or as a result of, that service.

Other programs funded with mandatory spending are the Montgomery G.I. Bill education benefits, vocational rehabilitation and independent living programs for service-disabled veterans, subsidies for VA home loans and insurance for service-disabled veterans and funds to provide headstones, markers and flags for decreased veterans.

As our Nation enters a war certain to result in disability and death for young Americans, the Budget Committee's proposed requires the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to make permanent cuts in the benefits paid to those disabled by virtue of their service to our Nation. These cuts must be made, so that our government can afford to provide a tax cut which will benefit only the wealthiest Americans, many of whom have never served in the military.

In contrast, Mr. SPRATT's amendment would restore the cut for benefits and health care and add $200 million to the VA health care budget.

I ask you now, who deserves to receive the benefits of the national treasury—America's disabled veterans or America's millionaires? I urge my colleagues to vote for the Spratt amendment.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, at a time when our federal budget faces huge deficits and we are engaged in a large military campaign halfway around the globe, now is not the time to slash taxes. Never in the history of our country have we fought a major war and cut taxes at the same time. Yet that is exactly what the Republican budget resolution does. These serious times demand that we act prudently, and that means we must pass a budget that meets our financial obligations.

The Republican budget makes permanent the $1.35 trillion tax cut passed in 2001, at a cost of $523 billion. It also implements the $694 billion ''Growth'' bill, the centerpiece of which is the elimination of the dividend tax. This plan will fail to spark an economic turnaround because it applies to only 25% of the population and less than 5% of the benefits take place this year when the economy needs it the most. According to the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, a similar tax cut proposed by the Administration would add $2.2 trillion in deficits over the next 5 years.

Because the first priority of the Republican budget is to cut taxes, programs dedicated to health care, education, and the environment suffer drastic cuts. To make room for tax cuts, at least $265 billion over ten years is slashed from programs like veterans' benefits, loans for college students, school lunch programs, and Medicaid.

Most concerning is that we really don't know how much the military operations and our occupation of Iraq will cost, but we do know that the U.S. alone will carry the tremendous burden of that responsibility. Estimates vary widely, and the lowest, most optimistic figure is $80 billion. With that enormous figure added to this year's deficit of $304 billion, common sense dictates that we refrain from additional tax cuts and return fiscal sanity to the budget process.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic budget alternative, which offers a sound, practical way to stimulate economic activity while paying down the debt and saving critical social programs. The Democratic proposal includes $136 billion in tax cuts and targeted investments this year. At less than one-sixth the cost of the Republican ''Growth'' bill, the plan allows the budget to recover while giving the economy the immediate boost it so desperately needs.

The Democratic alternative ensures that critical social services will continue to be provided at their current levels by restoring the cuts made in the Republican Resolution. It also provides $528 billion in new money for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, while the Republican proposal only offers $128 billion. The Democratic measure allocates $34 billion more for homeland security and $60 billion more for education over the next ten years, adds $10 billion more to help working families with child care over five years, and protects funding for Low Income Heating Energy Assistance Program, Women Infants and Children Nutrition, housing programs and other important initiatives.

If we pass another round of irresponsibly large tax cuts, government deficits will spiral out of control, especially as war increases our overall spending. We cannot saddle our children and grandchildren with this debt—we must decide now to adhere to the principals of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we take up this budget debate at a moment of great national challenge. The men and women of our armed forces have begun military action in Iraq. We wish them a swift and successful end to hostilities with a minimum loss of life on all sides. At this moment, when they are demonstrating such courage and sacrifice, we here at home must make responsible decisions about the kind of America we want for them and our children. The decisions we make tonight will affect the well being of our troops and all Americans for years to come. We must make important decisions about the future economic health of our nation and what investments we decide to make for the common good.

We need to adopt an economic plan that will put America back to work and a budget that reflects the priorities of the American people. Just as each family must make tough decisions about their own household budgets, so must we make tough decisions for our entire American family. How we decide to invest our collective resources should tell us a lot about what we care about as a people and who we are. The budgets and economic plans we adopt should reflect the values and priorities of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to the people in my district. I think I understand their priorities. And I believe that what they care about is what every American cares about. They want a country where every child has the opportunity to get a great start in life with a first rate education. They want a country where every American has access to quality health care. They want an America where there is a job for every individual ready to roll up their sleeves and go to work. And they want to know that their government is taking all reasonable steps to protect our homeland and be prepared to respond to national emergencies. These are the simple things we want for our families, our neighbors and our fellow Americans.

We are a great nation. We can do these things. Unfortunately, the Republican budget before us does not begin to meet the needs and priorities of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, just a short time ago I had the privilege of sitting in this chamber when the President gave his State of the Union address. At the outset of his speech, he made the following statement: ''We will not deny, we will not ignore, we will not pass along our problems to other Congresses, to other Presidents and other generations.''

Unfortunately, neither the budget submitted by the President nor the Republican Budget Committee proposal before us today passes that test. In fact the budget before us today does exactly what the President says he does not want to do. It does ignore our problems and, if we don't fix those problems we will be simply passing the buck to future Congresses, future Presidents, and future generations.

Look at education. Last year, with great fanfare, the President signed the Leave No Child Behind bill at the White House. Yet the ink was barely dry before the administration submitted a budget that fell well short of the promised funding. Well, when you leave the funding behind, you leave millions of children behind with nothing but broken promises. And the Republican proposal falls $9 billion short—almost 25 percent—of the funds authorized. That is a terrible message to send to our school children and teachers.

Look at health care. The Republican budget contains no meaningful proposal to address the problem of the 41 million Americans who have no health insurance. Apparently the Republican budget proposes to leave this problem to future Congresses and generations.

How about domestic security? The Republican's proposed budget ignores many of the needs outlined by the agency heads at the U.S. Customs Service, the Coast Guard, the Department of Energy and elsewhere. They have said they need far more resources to meet the threat than what is proposed in the Republican budget.

So what have the House Republicans proposed? What is their top domestic priority? Another huge tax cut that overwhelmingly benefits the super wealthy. Like the President, the House Republicans have decided that the most pressing domestic problem—the one issue that cannot wait—is that the super wealthy are paying too much in taxes. That comes on the heels of the $1.4 trillion tax cut from 2001 that disproportionately benefits the very wealthy.

And what will be the result of the Republican tax cut plan directed mostly to the wealthy? Even administration officials have conceded that it will do virtually nothing to stimulate the economy right now. The real result will be rivers of red ink and rising interest rates. The Republican plan would result in a $324 billion deficit this year and lead to one of the sharpest reversals in America's fiscal fortunes in history. And that doesn't even include one penny of the cost of the ongoing war with Iraq and its aftermath. The President's policies would take us from a projected $5.6 trillion surplus over 10 years to a projected $2.1 trillion deficit. The Republican Budget Committee proposal masks these long-term deficits by calling for huge and unrealistic cuts. The actual result of their tax cut proposals will be exploding deficits.

Who's going to pick up the tab for this growing mountain of debt? The American people of course. It's simple. There are only two ways to deal with it in the long run. Either we substantially raise taxes on the next generation or we dramatically cut the areas of largest expenditure—Social Security and Medicare. Already, funds from the Social Security trust fund are going to pay for the President's last round of tax cuts. Remember that ''lock box?'' Well, the lock has been picked and the raid is on. The Republican budget plan makes the problem even worse. It is a guided missile aimed at the heart of Social Security. And its not just money in the trust fund that will be lost; we will also lose the trust of the American people.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned with the reckless economic course proposed in the Republican budget. It does exactly what the President said in his State of the Union that he does not want to do—it ignores our very real current needs, and passes on the burdens of huge tax cuts to Social Security, Medicare and future Congresses and generations. I believe the Republican budget plan is out of touch with the true hopes and aspirations of the American people.

We have an obligation to confront our needs squarely now. We need to talk straight to the American people. The Democratic budget alternatives we are debating tonight all reflect the values and priorities of the American people better than the Republican plan. They correct the serious defects in the proposed Republican budget. All of them provide a great national investment in education, health care, homeland security, and prescription drug coverage for seniors. And they all do so without running up the huge deficits and debt contained in the Republican plan.

One shortcoming in the Democratic plans, however, is that—although they all provide a greater investment in our children's education than the Republican proposal, none of them reach the full level of funding promised in the Leave No Child Behind legislation. Full funding for Leave No Child Behind, IDEA and the other educational commitments we have made must be a top priority. I will continue to press for a budget that keeps all the promises we have made America's children.

While I am disappointed that the Democratic alternatives do not provide for full funding of these educational commitments, they come far closer than the Republican proposal. They also meet many other needs that are neglected in the Republican budget. I hope this Congress will adopt an economic plan and a budget that reflects the true priorities of the American people and does not pass the buck to future generations.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I support the Democratic budget and I reject the Republican budget.

The Democratic Budget invests in education and training. Our budget provides $3.2 billion more for education and training than the GOP budget in FY 2004 alone. Over the next 10 years the Democratic budget provides $44 billion more than the GOP budget. These budget increases mean increased funding for No Child Left Behind programs which reduce class sizes and provide advanced training for teachers.

The Democratic Budget also invests more in discretionary health care programs than the GOP Budget. The Democratic budget provides $2.9 billion more for discretionary health care in FY 2004, and $27.8 billion more over the next 10 years than the Republican Budget. Programs such as health professions training, rural health programs, Ryan White AIDS activities, and Healthy Start will be the direct beneficiaries of the Democratic Budget proposal.

The Democratic Budget is also preferable to the GOP Budget in Veterans' Health Care. The Democratic Budget provides $23 billion more than the GOP budget over the next 10 years for Veterans' programs. It provides $17 billion more for discretionary veterans' programs. It provides $15 billion more for mandatory veterans' programs—where the GOP budget cuts $15 billion from mandatory veterans' programs.

Finally, the Democrats budget call for spending $34 billion more than the GOP budget on Homeland Security over the next 11 years. One the other hand, the GOP budget freezes homeland security funding at the 2003 level. The Democratic budget, for example, would ensure that $3.5 billion in desperately-needed new money would be available for police officer, firefighters and emergency medical personnel. The GOP budget does not.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 236, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

AYES—192

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Case
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—236

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carson (OK)
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Combest
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Buyer
Gephardt
Hyde
Lipinski
Thornberry
Udall (CO)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2305

Mr. BURGESS and Mr. SOUDER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOPES AND PRAYERS FOR STEVE BUYER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AND HIS FAMILY AS HE DEPARTS FOR MILITARY DUTY

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD a letter that I received today.

''Dear Mr. Speaker: I have been called to active duty in the United States Army. Pending further orders, I request immediate indefinite leave of the United States House of Representatives to accommodate my military duties.

''Respectfully, Steve Buyer, Member of Congress''

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, the resolution we are considering affects one of our own today and may affect others in the near future. Our hopes and prayers are with STEVE and his family as he prepares to depart for Iraq.

OUR DUTY TO PROTECT AMERICA

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, we will be considering a very important resolution before us this evening. I rise in strong support of that resolution, and I expect that all of my colleagues would vote for it.

Our men and women in uniform are now engaged in an important conflict